

deal with urban and rural America as if they were separate, conflicting interests when in fact neither interest can be served independently of the other?

It is time for us to question whether urban areas can ever catch up when thousands of people every year are arriving, adding to already critical problems. In view of this, plus the increasing birth rate in the cities, it appears unlikely that public and private efforts can ever be sufficient to adequately deal with urban problems.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman said:

Many ghetto dwellers came from rural areas, or their parents came from rural areas. Back on the farm they also were poor, and they also were without power, but they did experience a sense of community and a solidarity of family that in too many cases the faceless city has shattered.

The Secretary went on to say:

The crisis of our cities, perhaps the most serious ever to face us as a people, has its roots in our failure to plan for change, our failure to develop public and private institutions and directions that would shape and control the unprecedented technological and productive forces that have been unleashed in the U.S. since the end of World War II.

In this period, our population has grown by 55 million—37%.

Our gross national product went from \$280 billion to more than \$800 billion.

Nearly 3 million farms disappeared in the technological revolution that swept—and is still sweeping—through agriculture.

More than 20 million people left the countryside for the city.

A third of our total population left the city and settled in suburbia.

All of this—and more—occurred without any real national recognition of what it meant.

What is needed is a reversal of this population trend. Rural America offers a viable alternative to further urban crowding. We must begin to establish a

rural-urban balance. It is time to literally give our urban areas breathing room. In order to accomplish this, there must be a concerted effort to develop our rural communities—in our rural areas. Rural America must no longer be forgotten land—a land to be from; a land of declining economies, a low level of limited job opportunities, and dwindling local tax bases.

First, we must improve agricultural and nonagricultural job opportunities. There must be increased public and private investment. People must be given encouragement and incentive to remain in rural areas. Industry must be encouraged to locate in rural areas.

I am reintroducing legislation designed to develop business and employment opportunities in rural areas, smaller cities and areas of unemployment and underdevelopment. The first provides certain preferences for prospective Government contractors in such cities and areas.

This legislation proposes that in the awarding of a government contract, credit be given for the size of the city as well as the degree of emigration.

First. If the bid received is from a city of 250,000 or less, a 1-percent credit is given.

Second. If the city is under 100,000 a 2-percent credit is given.

Third. If the city is under 50,000 population a 3-percent credit is given.

Fourth. If the area bidding is one where unemployment and underemployment exceeds the national average or where serious emigration problems exist, a 2-percent credit would be given.

The Secretary of Labor would determine at least quarterly, those areas of serious emigration.

The second bill provides incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial

establishments in rural areas. The Secretary of Agriculture will designate economically deficient rural areas. Business desiring to locate in these areas will be able to receive increased tax credit for plant investment, accelerated depreciation schedules, and additional wage deductions for low-income workers and training assistance for new employees. To qualify the firm must show that it will create new jobs and be able to employ low-income labor from the area. If a firm meets this criteria it will receive the following tax incentives:

A 14-percent investment credit on machinery instead of the regular 7-percent credit.

A 7-percent investment credit on the cost of the building, an accelerated depreciation of two-thirds for the normal life of the machinery, equipment, and building.

A 125-percent deduction for wages paid to low-income employees for a 3-year period.

These bills would discourage further concentration of population in large crowded metropolitan areas and the intensification of presently existing urban problems.

I feel that the passage of these bills would help to encourage a national policy of urban-rural balance.

Rural emigration to urban areas has created a crisis for each. The only permanent solution lies in a reversal of our emigration trend—a trend that is illogical and dangerous under present conditions. I hope that the Congress will act to encourage rural residence, and strike at the heart of the emigration problem—the lack of opportunity for employment in nonfarm production and services. I feel that the incentives proposed in these bills are in the best interest of our rural community, our urban areas, and on the Nation as a whole and its future.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 7, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Lead me in Thy truth and teach me,
for Thou art the God of my salvation.—
Psalm 25: 5.*

O Lord, our God, grant unto the Members of this body, and all who work with them and for them, a fresh sense of Thy presence as we take up the duties of this day. May we learn to think Thy thoughts after Thee and to keep our hearts open to our people that to us will come wisdom as we make decisions, good will as we relate ourselves to one another, and courage as we endeavor to do what is right and good for all.

In this moment of prayer do Thou—

Breathe on us, breath of God,

Fill us with life anew,

That we may love what Thou dost love,
And do what Thou wouldst do.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution making the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect of the United States.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will any Member-elect who has not been sworn come to the well of the House and take the oath of office?

Mr. TAFT appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE LATE HONORABLE A. LEONARD ALLEN

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I find it my sad duty today to advise the House officially of the passing of one of Congress most distinguished former Members, the Honorable A. Leonard Allen, of Winnfield, La. Mr. Allen died quietly early Sunday morning, January

5, 1969. He was born on a farm near Winnfield 78 years earlier, on January 5, 1891.

It has been my great honor, Mr. Speaker, to serve in the congressional seat which Mr. Allen held so long and so honorably. He began his service in the House on January 3, 1937, and was elected to the seven succeeding Congresses, retiring from the House on January 3, 1953, after 16 years of labor during the Nation's most crucial years.

Mr. Allen began his public service in 1914 as a schoolteacher. Subsequently he served as principal of two high schools and superintendent of the Winn Parish public schools. In 1922 he was admitted to the Louisiana bar and entered the practice of law, serving for a time as city attorney for Winnfield, La.

In the Congress Mr. Allen served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and helped write legislation affecting millions of America's young men and women.

Mr. Allen will be well remembered by those Members who were his contemporaries. And to those of us who follow in his footsteps he will continue to be an example for our own service and conduct. With his passing the Nation has lost a great patriot. His native Louisiana has lost an honored son. And many, many individuals, including myself, have lost a dear and trusted friend. We mark his passing with sadness and respect, and salute his memory here in this Chamber, which he loved so well and served so long and so ably.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the distinguished dean of the Louisiana delegation.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege, along with my colleague, HALE BOGGS, of coming to Congress 28 years ago when Leonard Allen was dean of the Louisiana delegation. We immediately found in Leonard Allen a most unusual warmth and an understanding and a dedication to his duties here in the Congress.

He was a man we will always remember. He was a man of high principles. If ever an individual could be given the appellation or description of a Christian gentleman, it was Leonard Allen. He had his days of humor with us, and he had his days of serious business with us, but we always found in him a most effusive, loyal, and dedicated man.

Certainly as dean of the Louisiana delegation now, and having had the privilege of serving so long with Leonard Allen, I extend deepest sympathy to his family and particularly to his son, who has become a very distinguished judge in his own right. It was a privilege to have served with Leonard Allen. It is with deep sympathy that we now realize he is no longer with us.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) and my colleague, the dean of our delegation (Mr. HEBERT).

I have very fond memories of Congressman Allen and his family and his very wonderful wife. Mr. Allen was most helpful to me as a young Member of this body. I served with him here for many years. I know he enjoyed a long and happy retirement. He was a very religious man, a Christian man.

I am sure Mr. Allen has earned a great reward in the hereafter. He made a great contribution to our State and to our country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late honorable A. Leonard Allen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT DE GAULLE OF FRANCE ADDS FUEL TO FLAMES IN MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. FARBERSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, and now comes President de Gaulle, of France, to add fuel to the flames existing in the Middle East. Let France remember that boycotts and embargoes work both ways.

The Israelis have been forced by the evermounting and continuous murderous terrorist attacks to strike with a terrible, swift sword against their enemies. Had they done anything less, it would have been interpreted by the Arab nations as a sign of fear and weakness, and undoubtedly heavier and greater acts of terrorism by the henchmen of the various Arab governments would have been initiated.

If there is to be criticism at this point, let it be equal. No critical outburst was heard when an Israel airliner was shot at, and a passenger killed, at the Athens airport. There was no tremendous outcry at the kidnapping of another El-Al airplane by the Algerian Government. There was no outcry whatsoever on black Friday, November 22, when 13 Israelis were killed and 57 seriously wounded and maimed for life in the marketplace in Jerusalem. There has been no condemnation of the continued Arab terrorist and murderous attacks on Israel border settlements.

If there is to be justice to all the parties involved, if there is to be peace in the area, then let the United Nations and the world leaders treat the entire situation evenhandedly without partisanship. If the United Nations truly believes in equal justice for all, if the United Nations truly wishes a peaceful settlement of the problems in the Middle East, if the United Nations does not have a double standard, then it must condemn the continual, unlawful, and terrorist attacks made upon Israel as

well as it has condemned Israel for its retaliatory action against those who have vowed to drive her into the sea.

If the retaliatory action taken by Israel is considered in the context of the continuous terrorism by the Arabs and the fact that Lebanon has become the capital of the terroristic Arab movement, the justice of Israel's position cannot but be understood.

Let us also beware of the sudden apparent pacific diplomatic moves by the Soviets. They are not in the interest of the United States.

SPEAKER McCORMACK TO RECEIVE ROA "MAN OF THE YEAR" AWARD

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there are few citizens of this great Nation who have merited honors for patriotic service more than has the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

We who have had the privilege of being his colleagues during any part of the four decades of JOHN McCORMACK's service know of his many virtues, all of which have made him one of the most admired, the most respected, and the most beloved leaders of our land.

Throughout the country, he has won recognition on many accounts—and he has deserved more honors than he could find time to accept. It is with great pleasure that I call attention to another highly deserved honor which will come to him on February 21 when the Reserve Officers Association cites him as "the citizen who has contributed most to the national security of the United States in these times."

Announcement of the award is carried in the following news release about this award from ROA:

ROA NEWS RELEASE

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 20.—An additional birthday honor came today to Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, John W. McCormack, with the announcement that the Reserve Officers Association has selected him for its highest award as the "Citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times." His birthday is tomorrow.

Known as the "Minute Man of the Year Award," the honor is presented annually at the ROA Mid-Winter Banquet, which will be held this year on February 21st at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C. Some 1,500 military officers from throughout the world are expected to assemble on this occasion, climaxing the annual two-day Mid-Winter Conference. Several hundred members of Congress and leaders of the military Services usually participate.

Brig. Gen. Homer I. Lewis, ROA National President, announced the selection of Mr. McCormack by the Association's National Award Board. General Lewis said:

"Speaker McCormack throughout his career has devoted his energies and influence to building a defense system second to no other power in the world, and thus, as much as any man in the Congress, has made it possible for the Armed Forces of the United States to protect this country and its government while at the same time preserving the basic freedom to which every citizen is entitled in the American Way of life."

General Lewis said he had notified the

Speaker of his selection in a personal interview and Mr. McCormack had accepted with an expression of deep gratitude to the ROA and the nation's reservists. Mr. McCormack is an Honorary Life Member of ROA.

The award to Speaker McCormack will be the twelfth made by the ROA. The first was presented in 1958 to Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, Chairman of the Board of Radio Corporation of America. The other awards follow in chronological order: 1959-Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.), Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; 1960-Col. Bryce N. Harlow, Deputy Assistant to the President for Congressional Affairs under President Eisenhower and slated for the same post under President Nixon; 1961-Hugh M. Milton, Under Secretary of the Army under President Eisenhower; 1962-Rep. Carl Vinson (D-Ga.) Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, now retired; 1963-Sen. Dennis Chavez (D-N.M.) who died prior to receiving the citation. It was presented posthumously to his widow; 1964-Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R-Me.), ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services Committee; 1965-Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.) Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; 1966-Sen. John C. Stennis (D-Miss.), Chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee; 1967-Rep. Robert L. F. Sikes (D-Fla.), ranking member of the House Defense Appropriations Committee; 1968-Rep. F. Edward Hébert (D-La.), member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the following is an excerpt from December issue of the Officer Reporter of the Reserve Officers Association:

HOUSE SPEAKER MCCORMACK CITED FOR HELPING BUILD DEFENSE SYSTEM, NAMED CITIZEN OF YEAR FOR 1969

Speaker of the National House John W. McCormack, who has publicly acknowledged ROA's help in narrowly averting a national defense disaster in 1941, has been selected by ROA to receive its 1969 award as "The Citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times."

Popularly known as the annual Minute Man Award and given each year at ROA's Mid-Winter Banquet, the honor will go to the veteran congressman before an anticipated record crowd at the annual banquet on February 21 at Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Brig. Gen. Homer I. "Pete" Lewis, ROA National President, announced the choice of Mr. McCormack by the ROA National Awards Board.

General Lewis said:

"Speaker McCormack throughout his career has devoted his energies and influence to building a defense system second to no other power in the world, and thus, as much as any other man in the Congress, has made it possible for the Armed Forces of the United States to protect this country and its government, while at the same time preserving the basic freedom to which every citizen is entitled in the American way of life.

"Speaker McCormack is recognized in the Congress as a leader who has used his influence and his leadership to side with the principle of strength. Few men in the past quarter century have had the privilege of contributing so substantially to the security which every citizen of the United States shares, even in these critical and trying times."

General Lewis said that the Speaker himself, out of his modesty, had given ROA and others part of the credit for preventing abolishment of the Selective Service System during the defense buildup just prior to World War II. It was in August 1941 that the House by a one-vote margin saved the Selective Service Act and thus the input of American manpower into the military training camps.

General Lewis said that he had notified the

Speaker in a personal interview of his selection to receive the Association's highest award, and that Speaker McCormack had accepted with an expression of deep gratitude to the ROA and the nation's Reservists.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 1.7 million schoolchildren this school year will receive a free or greatly reduced price lunch that otherwise would have been denied them had not the House voted overwhelmingly last session to put real muscle into child nutrition programs.

But hungry children come knocking at the door of the Congress again. Our action last session is only good for this school year. In addition, while we helped 1.7 million there are yet another 2.5 million schoolchildren who are being denied a free lunch.

We can do better than we have done. In response, I am offering again the legislation that led to the breakthrough which raised the number of children receiving free or reduced price lunches from 2.5 million to over 4.1 million.

We all know in face of the evidence before the Congress that additional funds are needed and especially for the food stamp and other programs to serve needy families—but in view of world conditions and in the face of fiscal reality, if priorities are set, one of the topmost is to meet the nutritional requirements of schoolchildren throughout the Nation.

These bills, like those of last session on which they are patterned, are the result of hours and hours of hearings, of the words and recommendations of school officials, nutritionists, doctors, and of private organizations and agencies. Those hearings established conclusively that hunger and malnutrition can be eliminated if adequate funds are made available, and if State and local governments carry out their responsibilities more effectively.

The first measure is H.R. 516, which will provide \$100 million a year for up to 3 years to strengthen the child nutrition programs. The funds would be automatically available from section 32 on July 1 of each year to the Secretary of Agriculture.

When the House passed its twin brother—H.R. 17872—last session, the proposal ended up in the final days as a one-shot, 1-year program at \$50 million, or half the level we approved. The need which prompted the legislation still exists, and will become even more grievous if all Congress does is to apply a 1-year bandage to a continuing, growing wound.

In one sense, action this session is even more critical than the last. The USDA and the States together have accepted the intent of the Congress to do more in child nutrition. Each State has developed a special program to reach more children utilizing the additional funds we made available, and the Department has revised its regulations to allow States to put more funds to work to feed more children in need. Together they have

structured in a very short time a program which is reaching those the legislation intended to help.

We cannot allow this new beginning to die from lack of support, nor can we in good conscience simply repeat this year what we did the last. We must go further along the road to good nutrition for children—we must do more.

I am told that we can reach all of those children who need free or reduced price lunches with an additional \$60 million, or a total of about \$100 million a year. Thus H.R. 515, which I am introducing today, will enable the Congress to meet its immediate responsibility to the hungry children of the Nation.

However, we should recognize, as the hearings on hunger and malnutrition clearly demonstrate, that money alone will not solve this problem. We must look to the processes of government which give this federal system of ours the ability to respond to the needs of the people it was created to serve. The success of the USDA and the States in putting the \$50 million to work to feed hungry children indicates that the federal system can function if the adrenal shock of need is clear enough.

But good government is not a passion of the moment, it is a lifetime enthusiasm for the concept of public service. We not only must enact legislation designed to serve a public need, but also insure that the system which is entrusted with its execution is equipped to do that job effectively.

We have, I fear, too often given our enthusiasm to the former and criticized the latter.

Thus, H.R. 515, patterned in nearly all detail after H.R. 17873, which this body enacted unanimously last session, seeks to find ways to resolve some of the barriers which stand in the way of public services reaching the people.

It will require that all States, for the first time, join with us in financing the lunch program. A number of States do this now; but most of them do not, and content themselves with using the children's payment to fulfill the matching requirement in the law.

The proposal also authorizes year-in-advance appropriations as a way to encourage the Department and the States to plan ahead for child nutrition programs with the knowledge that the funds to carry out those programs will be available. At present, Congress often decides its budgets in November, 3 months after the school year has begun. Schools seeking to expand nutrition programs must wait, and State plans cannot be tied down. Good nutrition is the victim of these delays.

The proposal also places specific requirements upon States and local school districts to develop and publish procedures for determining which children will receive free or reduced price lunches. Similarly, the proposal restricts the use of competitive food service in schools—or snack bars and other food services which operate in competition with the regular lunch program within the school. If our goal is improved child nutrition, then food services which are not based on sound nutrition concepts should not

operate at the same time as the lunch or breakfast program.

The proposal also authorizes the Department and the States to use up to 1 percent of the funds appropriated for child nutrition programs for nutrition education, and another 1 percent for experimental programs. We should give those charged with improving the nutritional status of children the tools to train and to try new methods.

With these, and other basically procedural improvements included in H.R. 515, we will have cleared away many of the restraints and barriers to effective program administration. Some may say we should not lay down requirements the States must follow. Yet, unless we do, no one else will—and we will have left unresolved the question whether the federal system can work.

I know it can, because we see it working—if not well—today. I know it will work better, because I know the caliber of people in the Federal and the State governments who want to make it work. I know it must, because we here today are charged with the ultimate responsibility to make it work.

I have read carefully through the testimony on hunger and malnutrition presented in hearings before my committee. While I find many accusations as to the actions taken by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department, the facts demonstrate conclusively that he has done an enormously creative job and has achieved more than one would expect based on his authority and the funding support given to him by the Congress. If he were to be criticized, it would be on the single point that the per family charges for food stamps are higher than they should be. Yet, even on this point, the Secretary's efforts to lower the purchase price have been limited by the restrictions we made on the money we appropriated. He could have done more had we made the appropriation for the food stamp program equal to the authorization. Our performance did not measure up to our promise.

I present these bills not as a vehicle to apportion the blame, but as a means of resolving the problem. The hungry are not interested in assigning guilt, but only in escaping from malnutrition. There is no excuse for a hungry child, and far less excuse for hundreds of thousands of hungry children.

We have the food, we have a delivery system capable of reaching every hungry child, and, with the bills I have introduced today, we will get this job done.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during the 90th Congress, there was a great deal of interest in the problems created by the tremendous flood of textile imports entering this country. The Third District of South Carolina is one of the Nation's major textile producing areas. Low-wage imports have been a matter of grave concern to me and a problem I have wrestled with for 20 years. Dur-

ing the past session of Congress, I introduced legislation which would have restored orderly trade in textiles and protected the jobs of the 2.4 million Americans who depend upon the textile and apparel industries for a livelihood. Almost 200 of my colleagues in the House sponsored similar legislation.

During the months since Congress adjourned, the problem of textile imports has become even more critical. The U.S. Department of Commerce has just announced that during the first 11 months of 1968 textile imports amounted to more than 3 billion square yards. This is 28 percent higher than the previous year, and 1968 will be an alltime record year. Virtually every month, new records are being set, and each new record level of imports means that more and more badly needed textile jobs are being displaced.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation, and particularly the textile-producing States, cannot afford to let this situation continue any longer. These imports are entering the United States not because they are any better or because they are more efficiently produced, but simply because they are made at wage scales and under working conditions which would be illegal in this country.

For this reason, I have acted at the earliest possible moment during this new Congress and introduced a bill, H.R. 184, which provides for fair and orderly trade in textiles. My bill is identical to the one which received such widespread support during the last session of Congress except for some changes in definitions and dates.

Mr. Speaker, this is an imminently fair and equitable bill. It provides for a reasonable level of imports, but at the same time, it will encourage the future growth and development of one of our most basic and essential industries.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with and carrying out the provisions of rule XI of the House, the Committee on Rules, on January 7, 1969, unanimously adopted the following rules of procedure for the Committee on Rules:

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, ADOPTED JANUARY 7, 1969

RULE 1. MEETINGS

The Committee on Rules shall meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday of each week while the Congress is in session. Meetings shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman or, in the absence of the Chairman, by the ranking Majority Member of the Committee present, as Acting Chairman.

Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when a majority of the Committee determine that testimony received may bear upon matters affecting the national security. Executive sessions of the Committee shall be closed.

For the purpose of hearing testimony, a majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

A printed transcript of any hearing or public meeting of the Committee may be had if the Chairman decides it is necessary, or if a majority of the Members request it.

A Tuesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with where, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor, and additional meetings may be called by the Chairman or by written request of a majority of the Committee duly filed with the counsel of the Committee.

RULE 2. VOTING

No measure or recommendation shall be reported or tabled by the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

A roll call vote of the Members of the Committee may be had upon the request of any Member.

RULE 3. REPORTING

Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee the Chairman or Acting Chairman shall report the same or designate some Member of the Committee to report the same to the House, as provided in the Rules of the House.

RULE 4. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The professional and clerical staffs of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of the members of the staffs and delegate such authority as the Chairman deems appropriate, with the exception of the Minority staff, who shall be selected by and under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 5. MISCELLANEOUS

The Committee shall prepare, maintain, and publish for the Members of the Committee, so far as practicable, a calendar listing all matters formally before it. Information on the Calendar shall include the numbers of the bills or resolutions, a brief description of a bill's contents, including the legislative committee reporting it and the name of the principal sponsoring Member. For purposes of this rule, matters formally before the Committee include: bills or resolutions over which the Committee has original jurisdiction, and bills or resolutions from other committees concerning which the chairman or designated member of such committee has requested a hearing in writing and forwarded to the Committee on Rules a copy of such bill or resolution as reported, together with the final printed committee report.

Upon adoption of the rules and procedures of the Committee at the opening of each Congress, the Chairman may have these rules and procedures printed in an early issue of The Congressional Record.

THE ORDEAL TO WHICH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ARE EXPOSED

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, a statement by William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, who served in the House and Senate more than a century ago should prove of interest, particularly to new Members.

Mr. Fessenden said:

When, a man becomes a member of this body he cannot even dream of the ordeal to which he cannot fail to expose—

Of how much courage he must possess to resist the temptations which daily beset him;

Of that sensitive shrinking from undeserved censure which he must learn to control;

Of the ever-recurring contest between a

natural desire for public approbation and a sense of public duty;

Of the load of injustice he must be content to bear, even from those who should be his friends;

The imputations of his motives; The sneers and sarcasms of ignorance and malice; and

All the manifold injuries which partisan or private malignity, disappointed of its objects, may shower upon his unprotected head.

All this, if he would retain his integrity, he must learn to bear unmoved, and walk steadily onward in the path of duty, sustained only by the reflection that time may do him justice, or if not, that after all his individual hopes and aspirations, and even his name among men, should be of little account to him when weighed in the balance against the welfare of the people of whose dignity he is a constituted guardian and defender.

LEGISLATION TO CREATE THREE ADDITIONAL JUDGES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, to join with three of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation for authorizing three additional judges for California's southern Federal court district.

The two full-time judges now assigned to this district, which encompasses San Diego and Imperial Counties, are bearing the heaviest caseloads in the Nation. During the past fiscal year, they each handled 1,025 cases, nearly four times the average of 265 cases for each of the 323 district court judges nationally.

The court district fronts on the international border with Mexico, accounting for an unusually high number of narcotics and illegal entry arrests which must be processed in the local Federal courts. Just 16 days ago presiding Judge Fred Kunzel worked into the late evening arraigning 27 suspects in an international narcotics smuggling ring. This is a problem peculiar to this district, and one that demands substantial relief.

The figure of three additional judges is not one plucked out of the air; it has been recommended by the prestigious U.S. Judicial Conference and endorsed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Authorities have been trying to meet the overload problem in the southern court district by the temporary assignment of visiting judges to the district. Clearly, this kind of stopgap arrangement is not a satisfactory solution to a dilemma that is achieving emergency proportions. Only through the assignment of permanent new judges to the district can the demands of justice be met in a realistic fashion.

My concern is fully shared by Congressmen BOB WILSON, JOHN TUNNEY, and JAMES UTT, who with me represent all portions of the two counties served by the southern court district. We all urge the Judiciary Committee to schedule the earliest possible consideration of this much needed relief for our overburdened court district.

A DANGEROUS MISSILE GAP

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, a Styx missile from an Egyptian ship sank the Israel ship, *Eilat*.

It has been brought forcefully to my attention that we have no missile as powerful, as accurate, or as difficult to detect as the Styx. Neither are any of our ships provided with detection devices which will give our men sufficient reaction time to shoot down or otherwise deflect the course of the missile.

Russian ships are equipped with Styx missiles, a reaction time of 30 to 60 seconds is required to shoot down or deflect this missile. Our detection devices permit reaction time of only 5 seconds. Steps should immediately be taken to develop capable detection devices on our cruisers and destroyers particularly in the Mediterranean area. Also, we should concentrate on developing a missile equal to or superior to the Russian Styx.

Truly, a dangerous missile gap exists in this area at the present time.

THE FRANK CARLSON SYMPOSIUM ON WORLD POPULATION AND FOOD SUPPLY

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, last month Kansas State University at Manhattan hosted the Frank Carlson Symposium on World Population and Food Supply.

The 2-day symposium honored Kansas' senior Senator, Frank Carlson, who retired on January 3, 1969, from 40 years of public life. Senator Carlson has been State legislator, Congressman, Governor, and Senator of our State. During four decades of public service, he has inspired the confidence of his constituents, the respect of his contemporaries, and the trust of his President. Through successive administrations, both Republican and Democratic, Senator Carlson has gone beyond the workaday role of politician to become a statesman.

SYMPOSIUM REFLECTS CARLSON'S PERSONAL COMMITMENT

Senator Carlson's own standards of personal commitment and concern, and his lifelong approach to the challenges of public service, led naturally to the fitting tribute which Kansas State University chose to honor Frank Carlson.

The symposium addressed itself to the central question of the future of humanity and the quality of life itself in the years immediately ahead. World population increases, balanced against the world's available food, present a fearsome challenge today. Tomorrow, this challenge could become insurmountable for free men, among whom respect for the individual is paramount.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY SHARES COMMITMENT

President James McCain and his staff at Kansas State are acutely aware of the dangerous instability of a hungry world.

The university has demonstrated compassion and competence through agribusiness development and assistance to emerging nations of Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

This competence may be documented in many ways, but clearly one parameter must be the Kansas State response to the State Department's call for technical assistance. Kansas State has provided significant contributions abroad, under Federal sponsorship, for over a decade.

The university currently participates in one project to assist cooperating nations develop their post-harvest storage control techniques. The importance of this assistance can be properly understood when one realizes that rodents in India consume as much as 40 percent of each year's grain production, according to responsible observers. Malnutrition throughout the world can be significantly reduced by more effective storage, and Kansas State is the vanguard of this effort.

The university provides technical assistance to Andhra Pradesh University in India, in connection with that nation's agricultural production promotion program. Kansas State also provides U.S. assistance in the crucial development of an agricultural and veterinary college at Ahmadu Bello University in Nigeria. Regardless of the outcome of the tragic war in Nigeria, the college established at Ahmadu Bello will be called upon to provide training essential for expanded agricultural production and proper nutritional balance throughout the war-torn area.

SYMPOSIUM BROUGHT TOGETHER LEADERS

It was natural, therefore, that Kansas State should honor Frank Carlson in this meaningful way. Common concern is common ground. The symposium brought together experts from business, government, the academic community, and the Congress. Dr. Milos Macura, the distinguished Director of the Population Division of the United Nations, was in attendance to present a major paper on demographic considerations in developing nations.

Dr. Lester Brown, of the International Agricultural Development Service, and Under Secretary John Schnitker, presented papers on the efforts of the Department of Agriculture in recent years.

Responsibilities of the academic community, the Federal Government, business, and the people themselves were all discussed by experts from each field.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, the first director of food for peace, under which over \$17 billion worth of U.S. agricultural commodities have been shipped to people in great need throughout the world, delivered the keynote address.

Among the leaders who affirmed their personal commitment to meet the challenges of world population and food production was the newest Senator from Kansas, the Honorable BOB DOLE, Frank Carlson's successor in the Senate of the United States. BOB DOLE distinguished himself in the House of Representatives as a member of the Agriculture Committee and made his own contributions to the solution of the problem to which the symposium addressed itself. It is reassuring

ing to humanitarians throughout the world that BOB DOLE will be able to carry on his efforts in this area as a Member of the Senate. He will perpetuate the leadership which Frank Carlson, Clifford Hope, Arthur Capper, Andrew Schoeppel, Harry Darby, and other Kansans have made in the development of adequate supplies of food and fiber for all who need them. Both data and ideas are essential if the growing imbalance is to be satisfactorily resolved. Much needed data and ideas were presented in Manhattan, many for the first time.

The Frank Carlson symposium assembled a distinguished cast of workers for humanity. It is comforting to know that these leaders of proven ability are devoting their energies and talents to the problems of the population explosion and subsequent food scarcity.

With their leadership, and the concern of an aroused public, there must be hope for the future.

Frank Carlson has always reflected optimism for humanity, as well as a deep personal belief in God and His understanding and compassion. It was particularly fitting that the deliberations in Manhattan reflected Senator Carlson's abiding confidence that we are capable of solving our most perplexing problems in the years ahead.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

(Mr. MESKILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 91st Congress I reintroduced my bill to double the personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$1,200. This bill, H.R. 50, contained the signatures of 24 cosponsors. Today, I am introducing an identical bill containing the names of five additional cosponsors.

I am more convinced than ever that this is a necessary and timely proposal as evidenced by the broad support which it has received. Labor leaders and business executives have all endorsed this idea. In addition, it received favorable editorial comment in some 60 newspapers across the country.

The present exemption is the most flagrant injustice of the income tax law. The \$600 figure has existed since the early days of the depression and does not reflect the present cost of feeding, clothing, educating, and maintaining a family member, which has more than tripled. My bill would raise the exemption to a much more realistic level.

Federal red-ink spending has caused so much inflation and has so raised the cost of living that the present \$600 exemption is nothing more than a token gesture. The Government has set \$3,000 a year as the level of poverty. However, in its tax policies it seem to claim that a person can live on much less. This is, of course, absurd.

The limit should ideally be much higher than even the \$1,200 proposed in this bill but my proposal would grant an urgently needed measure of relief without too great a reduction in Federal revenues. Any possible loss in revenue could

more than be made up by tax reforms. Plug up the existing loopholes and the loss in revenue would be offset.

The fact that many of my colleagues have seen fit to cosponsor this proposal points to the growing support for such reform. I sincerely hope that this Congress will respond to the will of the people and take quick and speedy action in approving this bill.

BEEF IMPORTS SHOULD BE HELD TO THE CALCULATED QUOTA FOR 1969

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on page 220 of the Federal Register, under the date of January 7, 1969, there appears a statement over the signature of John A. Schnitzler, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated December 31, 1968, which announcement referring to Public Law 88-482 reads as follows:

Such limitations are to be imposed when it is estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture that imports of such articles, in the absence of limitations during such calendar year, would equal or exceed 110 percent of the estimated quantity of such articles prescribed by section 2(A) of the Act.

The notice of the Department further reads as follows:

In accordance with the requirements of the Act the following first quarterly estimates are published:

1. The estimated aggregate quantity of such articles which would, in the absence of limitations under the Act be imported during calendar year 1969 is 1,035 million pounds.

2. The estimated quantity of such articles prescribed by section 2(a) of the Act during the calendar year 1969 is 988 million pounds.

Since the estimated quantity of imports does not equal or exceed 110 percent of the estimated quantity prescribed by section 2(a) of the Act, limitations for the calendar year 1969 on the importation of fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat (TSUS 106.10) and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (TSUS 106.20), are not authorized to be imposed pursuant to Public Law 88-482 at this time.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is again using 110 percent of the estimated quantity of meat imports as a base limitation rather than 100 percent as Congress intended. As has been pointed out to the Department on a number of occasions, the additional 10 percent was allowed in the law not to be used as the determination of the base, but was included to give the Department flexibility in making estimates of the volume of products which may be imported. It was included in the law because the Secretary himself asked for this leeway since he was not sure how close he might be able to estimate and thus asked Congress to give him a 10-percent leeway.

It was not the intent of Congress that this 10 percent should be used as a means of stretching or expanding the allowable volume above the calculated quota figure. It was not the intention of Congress that the base figure of beef to be imported should be 1,035 million pounds, as the Secretary sets forth in his notice.

Beef imports should be held to the actual, calculated quota for 1969. The 10-percent leeway may be used by the Secretary to prevent a violation of the law, but if it is used as it apparently is being used in the notice of the Department as a base, then, Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to take judicial notice of the fact that the Department deliberately plans to flaunt the law.

Mr. Speaker, I not only sincerely protest the intended flaunt of the law by the Department, but I shall ask the House Agriculture Committee to bring the Department before them to determine whether it is their intention to deliberately disregard the intention of Congress or whether they are going to force Congress to amend the law to compel the Department to interpret the law the way Congress intended that it should be interpreted.

REPORT PREPARED BY DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 36)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting a report prepared by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, required by section 610 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended. The report contains information on the salaries of certain officers and employees of organizations funded under the Economic Opportunity Act.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 1969.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting to the Congress the Seventh Annual Report of the Peace Corps.

The statistics of 1968 are impressive by themselves.

—Volunteers began serving in seven new countries, and plans have been set for programs in two more.

—The number of volunteers increased to more than 12,000 men and women serving in 59 countries.

But statistics tell only part of the tale. The two greatest achievements of 1968 were intangible.

For the first time, host country nationals were integrated into the agency's overseas staff. They helped to recruit volunteers in the United States and to train abroad. They assured the pursuit

of goals that they had established for themselves, not that we might have dictated to them. As a result, the Corps became a truly effective team effort for international understanding.

This report also shows proof of the relevance of the Peace Corps to problems we face at home. When the Corps began, it boldly promised that those who flocked to it for experience abroad would return better able to direct the destiny of their own country.

Of the 25,000 volunteers who have come home:

- A third have returned to school for advanced degrees.
- Almost a third of those employed teach in inner-city schools, working in jobs that educators find difficult to fill.
- Another third work for Federal, State, and local governments.

So a tour in the Peace Corps has become more than a two-year stint helping others; it has encouraged thousands of youngsters to pursue careers in public service.

This report is a testimony to America's commitment to the future. I commend it to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 1969.

TAX REFORM PROPOSALS—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 35)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.,
December 31, 1968.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Treasury Department specialists in tax policy some time ago undertook a major effort to prepare tax reform proposals of a comprehensive nature.

The Congress, in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, requested that proposals for a comprehensive reform of the Internal Revenue Code be submitted by December 31.

The studies and proposals for tax reform have been developed by the staff of the Treasury Department.

These studies and proposals, although reviewed by Secretary Fowler, should be viewed primarily as the technical product of the Treasury Staff. I have not received, considered, or made any judgments on these staff proposals. They are the technical product of the tax specialists in the Department and have not been discussed or examined by me.

I have conferred with the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the appropriate committees handling this legislation, concerning what seems most appropriate under existing circumstances. We believe that in justice to the Administration that will take office within the next month and

who will have to live with and administer any legislation passed, it is only appropriate that they have the opportunity to examine carefully and make their judgment on these matters. All data pertaining to this matter will be made available to the incoming Secretary of the Treasury promptly, and he and I have discussed this procedure and the Secretary-designate concurs in this decision.

The Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee has been informed that since the Congress will not resume until January 3, all data are available to the Congress when they desire to receive it. I have been today informed by the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Ranking Minority Member and the new Secretary that they will make their own arrangements for the proper consideration of any tax proposals that may be desired at a date acceptable to the three of them.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

CHAPLAIN CAPODANNO POSTHUMOUSLY AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I attended a very impressive and moving ceremony at the Washington Navy Yard. The occasion was the posthumous presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest military honor, to Chaplain Vincent Robert Capodanno, a lieutenant in the Navy Chaplain Corps who was killed in action on September 4, 1967, in Quang Tin Province, Republic of Vietnam.

Father Capodanno was born and raised in Staten Island, N.Y., which is part of the congressional district I represent. He attended Curtis High School in Staten Island and Fordham University in New York. He studied for the Catholic priesthood at Maryknoll Seminary in Glen Ellyn, Ill., Bedford, Mass., and New York City, and he was ordained a Catholic priest on June 7, 1957.

Father Capodanno had a distinguished record of service long before he won the Medal of Honor. He served as a missionary for the Catholic Foreign Mission Society in the Far East from 1958 until 1965.

He became a Navy chaplain on December 28, 1965, and began his service in Vietnam in April of 1966. From then until the time of his death he won the Purple Heart and the Vietnamese Gallantry Cross with Silver Star, among other awards.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am attaching a copy of the citation for Father Capodanno's Medal of Honor and a copy of the address given by Secretary of the Navy Paul Ignatius at the award ceremony.

Words, of course, cannot adequately describe this man's heroic deed, nor can a medal adequately honor his ultimate sacrifice; his service to his men and to his country and to his God are so extraordinary that they can never be fully honored. But for a man such as Father

Capodanno, for whom service to God and country came before any personal consideration, the fact that he died serving his God and his country, in a manner consistent with his strongest convictions, is more honor than we can ever give him.

This Nation and this world have lost an extraordinary man; we should be thankful that we had the benefit of his service and dedication for the time he lived.

The citation and address follow:

CITATION

The President of the United States in the name of The Congress takes pride in presenting the Medal of Honor posthumously to Lieutenant Vincent R. Capodanno, Chaplain Corps, United States Naval Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Chaplain, 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines, in connection with operations against enemy forces in Quang Tin Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 4 September 1967. In response to reports that the 2nd Platoon of M Company was in danger of being overrun by a strong enemy force, Chaplain Capodanno left his position of relative safety with the company command group and ran to the beleaguered platoon through an open area raked with fire. Despite the intense enemy small-arms, automatic-weapons, and mortar fusillade, he moved about the battlefield, administering last rites, giving medical aid to the wounded, and greatly inspiring all within sight or hearing. Although an exploding mortar round severed a portion of his right hand and inflicted painful, multiple wounds to his arms and legs, he refused all medical aid. Instead, he directed the corpsmen to treat their wounded comrades, and he continued to move about the battlefield with calm vigor as he provided encouragement by voice and example to the valiant Marines. Seeing a wounded corpsman directly in the line of fire of an enemy machine gun fifteen yards away, Chaplain Capodanno rushed forward to the corpsman, but was struck down only inches from his goal by a burst of machine-gun fire. By his heroic conduct and inspiring example, Chaplain Capodanno upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service. He gallantly gave his life in the cause of freedom.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

REMARKS BY HON. PAUL R. IGNATIUS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, AT POSTHUMOUS MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION TO LT. VINCENT R. CAPODANNO, CHAPLAIN CORPS, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 7, 1969

Mr. and Mrs. Capodanno, Admiral Moorer, members of the Congress, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

We are here today to award our nation's highest military honor to a truly heroic individual, Vincent Robert Capodanno, who was killed in action on 4 September 1967 in Quang Tin Province, Republic of Vietnam.

A lieutenant in the Navy Chaplain Corps, he is the third chaplain in our country's history to receive the Medal of Honor, and the second Navy chaplain to be so honored.

Indeed, men like Chaplain Capodanno are unusual men. From the time he accepted his appointment in the Chaplain Corps in December 1965, until his death, he repeatedly distinguished himself. The Purple Heart and the Vietnamese Gallantry Cross with Silver Star, among other awards, attest to this.

The act that Chaplain Capodanno so selflessly performed—the one that brings us here because it earned him his country's highest award—was consistent with the exemplary life he led.

Learning that the Second Platoon of the M Company, 5th Marine Regiment, was en-

gaged in savage fighting and might be overrun, he ran to join them. The unit was pinned down by enemy fire. Despite this, he proceeded to minister to the wounded and the dying.

His actions were an inspiration to the young Marines who saw him. His words of faith strengthened morale and provided encouragement to those who heard him.

Although seriously wounded in this action, he refused medical aid so that others could be treated, and continued ministering to his men. Seeing a wounded corpsman whose position was in the direct line of enemy fire, he dashed to his side. In so doing he made the ultimate sacrifice.

Today, it is my privilege to award Chaplain Vincent R. Capodanno the Medal of Honor, posthumously, for his heroism in the face of impossible odds; for his courageous support to the men who looked up to him for guidance and spiritual strength; and for his willingness to make man's greatest possible sacrifice for his country in its struggle for peace in the world.

Admiral Moorer, the Chief of Naval Operations, will now read the citation.

PORNOGRAPHY MUST BE KEPT OUT OF OUR HOMES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order to advise the House that I am introducing a bill which, if enacted, should prevent the use of the mails for the transmittal of obscene matters to our homes.

Every Member can attest to the outrage of the citizens of this Nation who, in spite of their every effort, have been unable to prevent the delivery through the U.S. mails of smut and pornography. This is particularly true when minor children are in the home.

In 1968 alone postal authorities received over 165,000 formal complaints from recipients of obscene mailings. My investigations reveal that most of these complaints were from parents of children who are of school age. In my judgment, this legislation is absolutely necessary to prevent unscrupulous publishers and dealers from using the U.S. mails as a pipeline for the unconscionable flow of smut and obscenity to minors.

The bill that I am introducing has been drafted to conform to recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions and would specifically prohibit mail-order sales of obscene materials to children under 16 years of age. My bill would make the unsolicited mailing of hard-core pornography to any family with children under 16 a Federal crime punishable by fine and jail sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and expression, and like all Members support the protections inherent in the first amendment to our Constitution. However, our Supreme Court has consistently held that hard-core pornography is not protected by the Constitution, particularly where the interests of children are concerned. Recently our Supreme Court in a landmark decision held that the rights of parents to direct their children's education and upbringing include the ability to protect them from offensive and obscene books and

photographs. Based upon this ruling and my conviction that the legislation that I have introduced does not violate any constitutional rights, I truly believe that if enacted it would be the answer to the removal of smut and pornography from homes in which young children reside.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national problem and requires the attention and action of this National Legislature. I hope that the Members will examine the bill which I am introducing and that they will support its enactment into law.

ISRAEL'S DETERMINED EFFORT TO STOP EXPORTATION OF TERRORISM IS THE ONLY WAY TO AVOID ANOTHER VIETNAM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much is being said today about Israel's destruction of some 13 civilian Arab airliners at Beirut Airport.

The United Nations, in a hasty, albeit poorly thought-out action, severely censured Israel when in fact the United Nations should have been addressing itself to the growing trend by the Communists to export terrorism in pursuit of their own goals.

Let there be no mistake about what is involved in this whole matter. Only the brave Government of Israel is able today to understand that the same kind of terror tactics which led to the war in South Vietnam are now being exported by terrorists to other parts of the world.

It may be difficult for the average American to understand this, but the fact remains that what we are witnessing in the world today is a gigantic effort by the Soviet conspiracy to continue the turmoil it started 20 years ago and to ultimately precipitate the destruction of Israel as a sovereign state. For Israel alone stands in the way of Soviet expansion into the Middle East and Africa.

I am mindful that the attack on the 13 Arab airliners at Beirut was forceful and severe.

But I am mindful also of the fact that the Government of Israel has stated with complete clarity, and in my judgment, complete justification, that it will retaliate for acts of terrorism against the Israelis at the place where plans for such terrorism are spawned.

I am amazed that the United States has joined in the denunciation of Israel without looking at all the facts.

There can be no doubt that the attack on an Israeli civilian airliner at Athens was but one more arrogant act of terrorism by the Arabs which the Israelis have endured since the rebirth of their nation.

Mr. William S. White, the distinguished American journalist, quite properly stated the case in his column of January 3 when he wrote that the Israel reprisal should be put into the perspectives of history. I shall include Mr. White's entire column at the conclusion

of my remarks. But at this point I should like to cite a significant observation by this outstanding American observer when he properly points out:

Week after week, month after month, year after year the Israelis have been drenched by the poisonous hatred of Cairo Radio.

He states further:

Eternally threatened, they have lived in a stockade state, much as did the American pioneers. Endlessly attacked along their frontiers, they have responded with a courage and an élan rarely seen in contemporary times.

Explicitly and repeatedly told by Arabs that they are going to be destroyed by Arabs, it is perhaps not too surprising that after two decades, it is growing difficult for them to see that "big picture" which statesmen far from the scene are pleased to paint for them.

Is it very surprising, then, that finally they react with undue violence, considering the further point that never once have they been granted elementary justice by a U.N. presently headed by the openly prejudiced Secretary General U Thant?

The simple, historic reality is that the Israelis have never stood a chance in the U.N., where the Russians and their tinpot and sometimes crypto-Communist allies among the African and Asian states have used this tough and tiny Western outpost as a kind of badminton shuttlecock in the cold war.

Thus it can be stated without contradiction that we cannot judge the Israeli attack on Beirut in total isolation. Looked at in its proper perspective, Israel's action emerges in a new and more meaningful light.

Mr. Speaker, in order for us to understand the magnitude of the Israeli effort toward world peace and its stubborn determination to avoid another Vietnam in the Middle East, it is important for us to recall the beginning of the crisis in Vietnam.

The record is replete with evidence the Communists staged violent acts of terrorism and subversion against the South Vietnamese until they brought this nation to the brink of collapse. The United States was forced into the conflict in order to save South Vietnam from this terrorism.

I have said time and again that Vietnam is the testing ground for the Communists' new technique of warfare—warfare through terrorism and subversion.

You cannot dismiss the acts of terrorism against the Israelis as the acts of individuals motivated by nationalistic passions and emotions.

The evidence will show that the ever-increasing violence against the Israelis both within their own boundaries and now in more remote areas such as the attack at Athens, are being carried out by a well-organized, and well-trained apparatus with its headquarters within the borders of the Arab States.

There are those who argue that Lebanon has had a 20-year record of passivity and discretion toward the State of Israel. This may be so, but the record now shows that Lebanon is today the citadel—with or without official sanction of the Lebanese Government—for various Arab terrorist groups that continue to plot aggression of the most brutal sort against Israel and her people.

In their attack on Beirut, the Israelis

were carrying out their policy of striking at the nerve center where these conspiracies against the Israelis are spawned. Beirut was not selected because it is an easy target. It was selected because the Lebanese Government has either failed or has chosen not to make its territory available to the terrorist groups attacking Israel.

I am placing in the RECORD at this point two documents prepared by the Israeli Government which I believe are important if we are to understand the present conflict in its proper perspective.

The first explains in detail the Israeli action at Beirut and the reason why Beirut was chosen.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a careful reading of the evidence contained in this document will demonstrate the degree of patience the Israelis have demonstrated for so long a time before finally taking action against the nerve center of conspiracy against Israel.

It is important to point out the extreme care Israeli troops took—at considerable risk to their own safety—to prevent civilian casualties.

Even in war, the Jews continue to reflect their historic concern for the value of human life.

I am also enclosing Prime Minister Eshkol's statement why Lebanon cannot disclaim responsibility for terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I am also including excerpts from Israel's statement to the United Nations delivered by her representative, Mr. Joseph Yekoa.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am including Mr. White's column in its entirety.

I believe these documents will help Americans better understand why the United States action in censuring Israel was precipitous and fails to take into consideration Israel's very valid reasons for her strong action.

Only tiny, but brave Israel understands that unless terrorism is stopped at the site where it is spawned, this kind of international violence will grow in intensity and finally engulf the world in another world war.

We owe Israel a debt of gratitude for her mature and historic understanding of the enemy and not condemnation of her effort.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can repair the damage done to world peace by the censure of Israel. I believe the United States should lead the way in inviting Israel into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and give her the collective security of the entire European community against Soviet aggression.

We now have three Mediterranean nations in NATO: Greece, Italy and Turkey. With the expansion of the Soviet fleet into the Mediterranean, Israel should be treated as a member of the European community and not isolated in the Middle East.

The United States should also make clear that while we seek peace in the Middle East and while we seek to live in friendship with all the nations of the Middle East, including the Arab States, the United States has a historic commitment to the survival of a free and sovereign Israel and we must consider any attack on the State of Israel an attack on the peace of the world.

The United States played a key role in the rebirth of the free State of Israel. The United States cannot sit idly by and watch the dissolution of Israel by her warring neighbors.

We cannot sit idly by because Israel alone bravely stands as a bulwark against Communist expansion in the Middle East and Africa.

It has been wisely stated that he who controls Africa—the rich-in-natural-resources continent of Africa—controls the world. We have a right to ask why the Soviet Union has rearmed all of the Arab States and why the Communists continue to foment unrest against Israel.

The answer is clear.

The Soviet Union perhaps even more than the Arab States themselves want to see the destruction of Israel because only Israel bravely stands in the way of Communist hopes for total domination of the Middle East and Africa.

The Soviets will fail. Anyone who knows the tenacious spirit and love of human dignity demonstrated by the Jewish people for the past 2,000 years despite indescribable persecution must quickly realize the Jews will not meekly surrender the homeland they sought so diligently for all of these centuries.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that it is important for Americans to understand all the issues in this tragic confrontation.

What happens in Israel and to Israel is of vital concern to all Americans.

The survival of Israel as a free state is not a sentimental journey for Jewish people alone. The survival of a free Israel is in the highest interest of the United States if Soviet expansion is to be checked and peace preserved.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should recognize Israel's difficult position and assist her instead of joining in condemnation.

This trend toward exporting terrorism must be stopped at all costs before it gets out of hand. The Israelis bravely have shown us how this international terrorism can be effectively stopped.

The material referred to follows:

THE ISRAELI ACTION AT THE BEIRUT AIRPORT, DECEMBER 28, 1968

A. LEBANESE RESPONSIBILITY FOR TERRORISM

1. Since September 1968, 18 terrorist incidents have taken place from Lebanese soil, with the overt encouragement of the Lebanese Government. The terrorist group most active in Lebanon is the one which calls itself "The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine." This is the group that claimed responsibility both for the hijacking of the El Al plane to Algeria in July 1968 and for the terror attack on the El Al plane at Athens on December 26, 1968. The group maintains its headquarters in Beirut and is allowed to function openly. Its communiqués are regularly published in Beirut. It was from Beirut Airport that the two perpetrators who sprayed machinegun fire and threw explosives at the El Al plane at Athens had departed. One passenger was killed and a stewardess wounded during that attack.

2. Lebanese official support for terror against Israel is reflected in numerous public statements. In the words of the Lebanese Prime Minister on November 2, 1968:

"Fedayeen action is legitimate, and no one can condemn the fedayeen for what they are doing. Their aim is to retrieve their homeland and their plundered rights. . . . Thus, I

say, fedayeen action is legal." (Radio Beirut, 11.2.68.)

Following the attempt to destroy the El Al plane at Athens Airport, Radio Cairo on December 28th quoted Lebanese official sources as "praising the courage of the perpetrators." This was echoed in the Lebanese daily El-Hadaf, 12.28.68: The action at Athens was an outstanding act of heroism. The path of struggle is a difficult one, but those who follow it faithfully will ultimately reach the goal."

B. SCOPE OF ISRAELI ACTION

3. As a result of the Israeli action at the Beirut Airport, December 28, 1968, 12 to 14 Arab aircraft were destroyed or severely damaged (9 jets and 3-5 turbo-jets.)

4. At great risk to themselves, Israeli troops at the Airport exercised the strictest precaution to prevent civilian casualties. The planes were emptied of passengers and ground crews, and people in the vicinity were led away to safety. Loudspeakers were employed to issue instructions in Arabic and English. The only shots fired were warning shots in the air. No fire was directed at people. There is no truth in the allegation that explosives and machine guns were used. Smoke bombs were employed against the possible arrival of Lebanese reinforcements. The runways were left untouched.

C. THE PURPOSE OF THE ISRAELI ACTION

5. In contrast to the severe precautions to avoid civilian casualties in the Israeli action, the terror attack on the El Al plane in Athens was one of cold-blooded murder. Thirty-eight passengers including women and children, were in the plane when it was struck by grenades and machinegun fire. That the plane, with its 30 tons of fuel, did not explode on the spot was due more to chance than design.

6. The Athens incident was the second act of violence in six months by a Beirut-based terror group directed against the Israel national airline. Following the piratical act in July, Israel made it clear that it would not tolerate interference with the free and innocent movement of its aircraft.

Last week's criminal attack at Athens Airport again highlighted the dangers inherent in this method of terrorism which may be expected to spread if no reaction is forthcoming.

7. Israel has no desire in worsening its relations with Lebanon. It is, however, obliged to defend itself against any aggression at the place where it is planned and carried out. States that make it possible for terrorist groups to organize and perpetrate acts of terror bear responsibility for the aggression. Under the rules of international morality and law, no State is allowed to harbor and encourage armed forces operating from its territory against a neighboring State, and then be considered immune from reaction in self-defense.

8. For Israel, a country surrounded on every border by enemies foresworn to its destruction, the national airline is a vital life-line to the world outside. Any attempt to interfere with its legal freedom of movement is a blow at Israel's security.

LEBANON CANNOT DISCLAIM RESPONSIBILITY FOR TERRORISM

(Statement by Prime Minister Eshkol, Jerusalem, December 29, 1968)

After the piratical act of the kidnapping of the El Al Plane last July, we refrained from reacting in force and took diplomatic action instead for the release of the plane, crew and passengers. I made it clear at that time, on behalf of the Government, that we would not accept any interference with the free movement along our air routes. I emphasized that kidnapping not only endangered Israel but also violated principles of freedom and safety of aviation, and I called for a cessation of acts of this kind.

UNPRECEDENTED CRIMINAL ATTACK

Unfortunately, an end has not been put to this dangerous practice. Once again, an unprecedented criminal attack has been perpetrated, this time on an El Al plane at the International Airport at Athens. Terrorists threw hand-grenades and Molotov cocktails, and shot from machine-guns at a civilian aircraft carrying passengers in innocent flight to their destination. One of the passengers was killed, and a stewardess was wounded. It was only by chance that the assault did not claim a larger number of victims. The aim of the assailants was to kill dozens of people and by spreading fear paralyze Israel aviation.

The attack was carried out with the purpose of causing a large number of casualties. It is difficult to exaggerate the gravity of this deed of violence and bloodshed. No State has the right to ignore the danger emanating from such a criminal method of terrorization, which may be expected to spread if no reaction is forthcoming.

LEBANON BEARS RESPONSIBILITY

We have no desire whatsoever of worsening our relations with Lebanon. Israel is interested in a delimitation of the hostile front—not in its expansion. But we are obliged to defend ourselves against all aggression, in the place where it is planned and carried out. This practice adopted by our enemies must stop. States that make it possible for terrorist organizations to organize and perpetrate acts of terror bear responsibility for aggression, a responsibility they cannot disclaim. This is accepted as a fundamental principle of international law. On no account can we accept the notion that the waging of war against Israel should be permitted if those who wage it call themselves this or that organization and not a government.

The facts are clear: the terrorist band that struck at our plane operated out of Beirut. In Beirut are located the headquarters of the organization that carried out the deed. From Beirut went out the organization's words of bravado concerning its deed—as well as the statement proclaiming its intention to continue with actions of this kind. Under rules of international morality and law, a State is not allowed to harbor and encourage an armed force operating from its territory against a neighboring State and be considered immune from reaction.

These terrorist methods employed by Israel's enemies strike not at Israel alone but are capable of causing the gravest interference in international civil aviation.

Israel calls for the honoring of the rights of all States to fly their international airlines in freedom and safety.

EXCERPTS FROM ISRAEL'S REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, MR. YOSEPH YEKOA, AT THE SECURITY COUNCIL, DECEMBER 30, 1968.

Inhuman in its lust for blood, indifferent to the catastrophic dangers involved, oblivious of international interests and rights, the attack in Athens was the most despicable of acts of violence committed in the course of Arab warfare that continues against Israel in violation of the cease-fire. "A cowardly act of barbaric insanity" labelled it the *Ceylon Daily News* of 28 December. "Another act of insanity" cried the *Buenos Aires Herald* on 27 December. "A condemnable act" said *Dagens Nyleter* of Stockholm on 28 December.

From all continents, from all parts of the world, came expressions of shock and anger.

The attempt to blow up an airplane with all its passengers and crew and endanger the lives of many others at a neutral airport was of the same character as throwing grenades into a crowded bus station, exploding dynamite charges in a market place, placing button shaped mines in school yards, planting mines under tourist buses. Defeated in their

aggression of May-June 1967, the Arab States were now trying to prove their mettle by war against women and children. Thwarted in their openly proclaimed plan to destroy Israel and annihilate its people in 1967, the Arab governments have turned in 1968 to bleeding Israel by murder of the innocent and defenseless, by terror and sabotage. At the Athens airport the warfare by stealth, merciless and indiscriminate, reached new depths of baselessness. It was clear that it must not be left without reaction.

Where was the action to come from? The world, shocked as it was, remained paralyzed and the governments strangely silent. The people of Israel were once again on their own. Israel knew that it was again up to itself to uphold its rights, to protect its citizens, to prevent a stranglehold on its air lifeline.

The decision was taken. Israel acted. Yet how different its action was from that of the Arab aggressors.

The attackers of the El-Al aircraft in Athens testified that they were Lebanese who came from Lebanon. One of them was Lebanese born, the other a resident and national of Lebanon. Both lived in the city of Tripoli. Both were members of the Palestine Liberation Front, the same terror organization that claimed credit for the act of piracy committed against the El-Al plane last June. Its headquarters are situated in Beirut.

In the last months the concentration of raiders increased especially in the vicinity of the Lebanon Israel cease fire line. The number of sabotage raids in this area between August and December 1968 was twenty two. The encouragement and the complicity of the Lebanese government are no doubt accountable for the rapid expansion of the front activities.

Prime Minister Al Yofi has announced several times that his government supports terror operations against Israel. This morning he declared again, "The *fedayeen* operations are legal and sacred."

An opinion was expressed in this council that Israel's action was disproportionate to the terror attacks that preceded it. When would Israel's action have been proportionate to them? Had the assailants of the aircraft in Athens succeeded in blowing up the plane and killing the fifty persons aboard, or they brought about the explosion of other airplanes on the field and of the airport installations, would this have made the Israeli action proportionate? Should we have waited until Arab warfare succeeded in bringing about such a catastrophe? Should we have waited until terror attacks from Lebanon against Israel territory resulted in more casualties and more damage?

It is odd to hear several supporters of Arabs aggression in the Middle East suggest that Israel pay compensation for the aircraft destroyed at the Beirut airport field. And who will pay for the lost Israeli lives? Is the single life of the Israeli engineer killed in Athens, while on a U.N. mission, worth less than all the metal and wire and upholstery destroyed in Beirut?

Who will determine this? Or are the shares of the owners of the Arab airlines more privileged than human life? Who will compensate Israel for the hundreds of its citizens killed in the course of the existing cease-fire? Who will make reparations for the damage of the border villages that are being shelled incessantly or the Jews, lingering since June 1967, in Arab concentration camps. Or the property of nearly a million Jewish refugees from Arab lands, for twenty years of Arab war against Israeli territory and people?

Here in the Security Council of the United Nations, a quarter century after the defeat of Nazi barbarism, are we to hear that the scrap iron of airplanes is worth more than Jewish blood?

It is perhaps not by accident and it may even be symbolic that the most penetrating assessment of the situation came under the name of Winston Churchill, the younger

Winston Churchill, in the *London Evening News* of 30 December, today: "On the one hand . . .", he wrote, "A deliberate (but bungled) attempt was made to destroy an Israeli civil airliner as it was taxiing out for takeoff with 51 people aboard. On the other hand a raid that resulted in the destruction of 13 empty aircraft that was meticulously planned and executed to avoid loss of life (and it appears, succeeded in this respect) should come in for so much more condemnation from the British, French and American governments than the deliberate attempts to destroy an airliner with all its passengers aboard . . ."

Israel desires tranquillity on the cease-fire line with Lebanon as on other cease-fire lines. There will be tranquillity if Lebanon abides by the cease-fire and puts an end to acts of violence by terror organizations operating from its territory, contrary to the cease-fire. In the last twenty years such acts of aggression have only brought disaster and suffering to all the people of the area.

I have returned from Israel two hours ago. I have found the people and its government determined to follow a course of peace, resolved to end the war that has plagued the Middle East since 1948. But I have found a people which, if war continues to be waged against it, will defend itself with all its soul and all its heart and all its might. To this people it is immaterial how this warfare is being waged or how it is defined. Whether attacked by the shell of a regular army's artillery or by the bazooka bomb of an irregular military force, the people of Israel will defend itself. Whether death is forced upon it by an Arab army or by a terror warfare organization supported by Arab governments and committed to Israel's annihilation, the people of Israel will not yield to it. They will repel it as best they can, by whatever means they possess. For in the struggle for life it is the right to live that precedes all. I have found a people that has suffered all too much, all too long, to be deterred from achieving its objective—to live at peace, real peace, like all other nations. I have found a people that will not agree that laws valid for all should be non-applicable to itself.

It must end. The Arab States can and should end it. The Security Council must call upon them to do so. To omit such a call again can only encourage further breaches of the cease-fire. If peace is to come, the cease-fire must be maintained. There is no reason why it should not be. Israel hopes that all governments in the area will now realize that it is in the interest of all of us to respect the cease-fire and to prevent all its violations by whatever means committed, so that we may devote our efforts fully toward the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

[From the *Washington Post*, Jan. 3, 1969]
ISRAEL REPRISAL SHOULD BE PUT INTO THE PERSPECTIVE OF HISTORY

(By William S. White)

All this breast-beating condemnation of Israel by "world opinion" for the Israelis' reprisal attack upon the airport in Lebanon needs some cool re-examination and some factual perspective.

It is true that Israel's action here, in retaliation for a terrorist Arab assault upon an Israeli aircraft in Athens in which an Israeli lost his life, was unwise and excessive—if judged in total isolation. For Lebanon has been a moderate force within the Arab bloc and has thus far joined only by words in the "holy war" being conducted against Israel by more vehement—and Communist-oriented—states such as Nasser Egypt.

Still, this whole business cannot be understood out of its whole context. When all the facts, and not just some of them, are seen without prejudice, Israel comes off incomparably better than it is coming off in the ex-

cited indictments now being flung about inside and outside the United Nations.

First of all, Israel's commandos at any rate took the greatest care in Lebanon to take no man's life. But the essential points are vastly deeper. Here is a nation dug out of the hard, arid earth that for all its life has been tirelessly menaced by extremist Arabs from every side.

Week after week, month after month, year after year the Israelis have been drenched by the poisonous hatred of Cairo Radio.

Eternally threatened, they have lived in a stockade state, much as did the American pioneers. Endlessly attacked along their frontiers, they have responded with a courage and an élan rarely seen in contemporary times.

Explicitly and repeatedly told by Arabs that they are going to be destroyed by Arabs, it is perhaps not too surprising that after two decades it is growing difficult for them to see that "big picture" which statesmen far from the scene are pleased to paint for them.

Is it very surprising, then, that finally they react with undue violence, considering the further point that never once have they been granted elementary justice by a U.N. presently headed by the openly prejudiced Secretary General U Thant?

The simple, historic reality is that the Israelis have never stood a chance in the U.N., where the Russians and their tinpot and sometimes crypto-Communist allies among the African and Asian states have used this tough and tiny Western outpost as a kind of badminton shuttlecock in the cold war.

But there is an even more fundamental truth, and it is this: It is no longer liberally chic to be pro-Israel, where once it was too liberally chic altogether. Twenty years ago, "elite" American opinion sentimentalized Israel out of all reason. Today, "elite" American opinion can hardly find anything good about the Israelis.

It would require a book fully to explore this turnabout; this columnist's opinion is that Israel has fallen out of grace not because of its considerable faults but rather because of its old-fashioned virtues.

For the Israelis oddly cling to certain outmoded concepts which in a short-hand way are more conservative than otherwise, to wit:

They do not happily embrace any and all "revolutions," such as Col. Abdel Gamal Nasser's exported "revolutions" in places like Yemen. They feel no shame in being patriots. They love their country; they will unhesitatingly fight for it. And they will not be talked out of their right—and duty—of self-defense.

They do not accept the new isolationism, the new peacenikism, of the New Left now so popular in quarters here and abroad. Having been told several thousand times that pro-Communist Arabs intend the literal destruction of their way of life, they have come to believe it.

That Lebanon is not really a part of this conspiracy is true enough. That Lebanon's airport has been attacked is in every way regrettable. But that the world can hardly expect a people so long brutalized by hostile neighbors to respond in every instance with all prudence and restraint is surely also true. When a man is fighting for his life, it is a little hard to expect him to proceed with all the solemn care that might be exercised by some fellow who never felt a wound.

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF HOLDERS OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDALS OF HONOR INCIDENT TO ATTENDANCE AT PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 83) and ask

unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 83

Resolved, That there are authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on vouchers approved by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not to exceed \$15,000 for the payment of expenses incurred by holders of Congressional Medals of Honor incident to their attendance at the presidential inauguration on January 20, 1969.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This resolution would authorize the expenses from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in an amount not to exceed \$15,000 for the payment of expenses incurred by Congressional Medal of Honor holders incident to their attendance at the forthcoming presidential inauguration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to enumerate the heroic services made by this distinguished group of Americans.

Suffice it to say that there is too little opportunity to express the gratitude of the Nation to this heroic group of our citizens. These men, all of whom have performed acts of gallantry and bravery above and beyond the call of duty, have been invited to attend and participate in the presidential inauguration and the varied activities associated therewith.

There are only 279 holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor who are living today. The medal they wear so proudly and with justification for heroic acts of heroism was not awarded in the name of any single administration or in the name of the executive or judicial branch of Government. It was awarded in the name of this body—the Congress of the United States. These men are recipients of our medal—the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is, therefore, appropriate that this body appropriate from its contingency fund moneys to underwrite the cost of their trip to Washington to accept the invitation already tendered to attend the inauguration of the next President of the United States.

To refresh our memories about the caliber of men we are honoring by this small token of recognition, let me cite a few brief facts about the Medal of Honor. It is awarded by the President of the United States in the name of Congress to persons who, while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, perform acts of heroism at the risk of life.

To receive the Medal of Honor each recipient must meet the common standards of "above and beyond the call of duty." Yet, as a group, they are uncommon for they represent no single military rank or branch of service, profession or station in life, or race, color, creed, or national origin.

I support this resolution and urge that it be expeditiously approved.

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, United States Code, section 715a, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. DINGELL, of Michigan, and Mr. CONTE, of Massachusetts.

RECEPTION FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, IN THE LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last evening the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate were privileged to have as honored guests the President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson. The reception was held in the Longworth House Office Building in honor and recognition of the President and the First Lady for their many years of devoted service to the American people. More than 400 Members, both Democrats and Republicans, came to pay their respect to the President and to the Presidency.

The President was relaxed, pleasant, and in high good spirits, and the First Lady, as always, was the gracious, charming First Lady who has captured the American people's heart. It was a thrilling experience for those who attended to see the President in such good spirits and in turn to see the sincere and genuine expression of friendship on the part of all Members.

Whatever our party affiliation or our districts or whatever feeling any of us might have had about particular legislation, last night was an evening that laid aside all differences and complete emphasis was placed on a genuine spirit of appreciation.

Having spent some 40 years in the Nation's Capital as a public servant, the President can look back on many great accomplishments and recall many exciting moments of our country's history. As Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President, he served his country nobly. He has been a moving force in every momentous decision that this Nation has had in the last 30 years, at least. During the past 5 years as President, more accomplishments have been achieved than perhaps in any similar period of history.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, history will record that more great achievements were reached during these past 5 years than

in the last quarter of a century. And as the President has worked on these matters, always there was the quiet presence of Lady Bird Johnson who has been the inspiration for the President all of these years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the exchange of remarks made by those who were privileged to say a few words at this ceremony. It was one of the most delightful evenings in Washington. I submit we should share these comments with all American citizens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARL ALBERT. Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention just a minute.

We are all so happy that our great President has turned out to be with us and our lovely First Lady, Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson. We are not going to make a formal function out of this, but we do have a couple of presentations that we would like to make on behalf of the Members of the House.

First of all, on behalf of the Leadership and the Capitol Historical Society, I want to ask Fred Schwengel to make a presentation to the President.

Mr. FRED SCHWENGEL. Mr. President and Mrs. Johnson, Members of the Leadership and my colleagues and good friends:

Mr. President, you, like many of us, have been highly honored, and you, more than the rest of us. We have been honored with your presence here. All of us have tried to honor our country as you have with service.

Now I am honored, as President of the United States Capitol Historical Society, to present to you a collection of books, a book in six world languages.

Allen Nevins wrote for the preface, "Since 1800, the Capitol has been the scene of grim, hard work by many thousands of conscientious legislators and their aides who have thought little of public fame, but much of accomplishments and their tasks."

Mr. President, you were one of those who served so ably, first as an aide and then as a legislator. A grateful House of Representatives presents these volumes in languages spoken by more than a billion people in this world in the hope that they will bring back many pleasant memories to both of you and to one like you who has no peer in his love for his country and the Capitol.

I am reading from a card that goes with this presentation. It is signed by Speaker McCormack, Mr. Carl Albert, Gerald Ford, Hale Boggs and Leslie Arends. With this present, Mr. President, I join your many colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, in wishing you well, Godspeed and bless both of you. Come back to see us. Thank you.

Mr. CARL ALBERT. The House is happy to welcome back one of its most distinguished former Members, who has a pretty important job now, the distinguished Majority Leader of the Senate. Mike, we want you to say a word.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Lady Bird, Members of the Leadership and my colleagues in the ranks:

If there was one thing I learned in the House, it was to be brief. So, Mr. President and Lady Bird, all I want to say is "Banzai! May you live 10,000 years."

Mr. CARL ALBERT. Now I want to present the loveliest person I ever presented, our First Lady.

Mrs. JOHNSON. May I say thanks very much for those volumes about the Capitol. The Capitol was my beat for a long time. Really, when we say goodbye to Washington, the address of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue was a small span of time for us in comparison to the years we spent closely affiliated with

this building and very close to so many people who serve here.

So I am delighted to see you tonight. I am happy that you asked us here and thank you for those books. We are very proud of them.

Mr. CARL ALBERT. My own strong right arm, the distinguished Majority Whip, Hale Boggs.

Mr. HALE BOGGS. Mr. President and Mrs. Johnson, my colleagues: I can only say on behalf of the Speaker and Carl and myself that all of us are very proud of this turnout, Mr. President. This is a bipartisan turnout. It is a tribute to you, the President of the United States, and your lovely wife. We thank all of you for coming.

Mr. CARL ALBERT. The greatest living legislator in the free world, or any part of the world, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who will take over.

The SPEAKER. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, my distinguished colleagues of both branches of the Congress: You have honored us, Mr. President and Mrs. Johnson, by accepting our invitation to join with us on this occasion. It shows your simplicity, not only your great leadership, but your simplicity as a man, and both of you as human beings.

The House of Representatives and the Senate, without regard to party, entertain for the both of you the highest feeling of friendship and respect and, of course, I have entertained for you and Mrs. Johnson for many years the deepest and most profound feeling of friendship humanly possible and have enjoyed the very close association that has existed between us.

You have been President of the United States during a very trying period of our Nation's history and of the world's history. As I said on the Floor and in the Democratic Caucus, you will go down in history as one of the great Presidents of our beloved country.

As a manifestation of the deep respect and friendship that all of us entertain for you and Mrs. Johnson, I am very pleased, acting for my colleagues, to present to you, Mr. President, and to you, Mrs. Johnson, this beautiful plaque which means so much in the life and history of our country, this building, the Capitol.

To me, as I approach it every morning, it impresses me as if it is the first time I saw the Capitol and the dome. It means so much in the life and history of our country, the Capitol of the United States, that I am very happy, acting for my colleagues, to present to you this beautiful and expressive and significant plaque which I know will be always treasured by you and Mrs. Johnson. The plaque reads:

"To Lyndon Baines Johnson, teacher, legislator, leader, Vice President of the United States, President of the United States, supreme patriot."

It is signed by John W. McCormack, Speaker; Carl Albert, Majority Leader, and Hale Boggs, Majority Whip.

With this plaque, Mr. President, goes our deep affection and friendship for you and Mrs. Johnson.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker and my beloved friends: When I received the Speaker's gracious invitation to come up here this afternoon, I accepted and I accepted very eagerly. I reasoned that it never hurts a private citizen to know a few people in public office.

I have never really thought, though, that we were exactly strangers. I don't know how many letters—I am told that we have 31 million pages of material that is enroute to our library from the House and Senate and Presidential days. I really haven't counted the number of letters and special messages I have sent to each of you individually or collectively or even how many telephone calls I have made to you or what time of day I have made them.

But one thing I am sure of, and I believe there will be no division between Democrats and Republicans on this: There has been no communications gap between the President and the House of Representatives.

I imagine if some of you Members had it to do over again, you would never have given your unlisted numbers to the White House operators.

But it has not been a one-way street. You have kept the line of communications open. I doubt if there is a single Member of the Congress who served during my term of office who did not make his views known to me one way or the other. If some of you preferred to use the Washington Post or the Star over the postal service, that is all right.

As I think about it in retrospect, I am not entirely without fault on that score either. I have even been known to use all three networks at times, just to save a stamp. I am not sure it was ever faster than the mails, either. I remember I once asked you early in May to bite the bullet, and I didn't hear the crunch until late in June. Some of the things I heard in the meantime I can't even repeat here this afternoon.

Sure, we have had our differences. We have sometimes aired some of them in public. I have not completed all the studies I am going to make on all the 36 Presidents. I have just started seven volumes on George Washington and I have not gotten down to the members of his family yet, and some of the official documents that came to their possession. But I do believe that I am one of the very few Presidents ever to leave the office of the Presidency without any feelings whatever of bitterness or rancor toward the Congress of the United States.

So the emotion that is in my heart this afternoon are these: Nostalgia as I prepare to take my official leave of you after an association of almost 40 years. I was much more sure of myself last March 31st. We had known for some time, for some years, what we were going to say, but we did not know how to say it or when to say it, and finally January came, and then February, and then March. We just felt that that was the last; we had to do it in March.

So we did say what we said on March 31st. I would not change a word of it. If anything, I would hurry it a little bit. I am just as positive that what I said was in the best interest of this Nation and this world and of myself and my family as I can possibly be.

But I do have to admit to you in candor that you created some doubt, perhaps a little question of my own judgment and intelligence, when I heard on the radio coming up here that 13 days before I leave office you raised the President's salary from \$100,000 to \$200,000. After staying around here 40 years and leaving 13 days before that salary raise, that doesn't show very good judgment on my part, does it?

But I will say this: The poor President who will occupy this office for four years will earn every dollar of it, and then some. And you are going to earn every dollar that you have the willingness to accept.

Now outside of nostalgia, I want to say something else. I feel much gratitude as I remember all of the help and guidance that you have given the President. And finally, I feel profound respect as I think of the hundreds of billions that you have helped to enact to strengthen America.

With all the recent calls for Congressional reform, your accomplishments have somehow often been overlooked and a valuable sense of perspective has been lost. I am not saying that reform is not needed. Man has yet to devise any institution that can't be improved. There is a need for reform and there is a need of modernization every day. But to say that improvement is needed is not to say that the Congress has not acted properly and is not capable of performing its duties well.

I believe otherwise, and the facts, I think, bear me out. I believe we have just witnessed one of the most creative and one of the most productive eras in the history of the entire American Congress.

When I look back over the various Congresses, some 90 of them, those Congresses find a place in history if they can make a major contribution to just one area of American life. But you Democrats and Republicans have opened new horizons in dozens of fields. I won't list them all, but I do say that you were an Education Congress. There are some 70 bills that have been passed. And in five years you passed 60 bills of the 70 in education.

You were a Civil Rights Congress. You were a Health Congress. Of the 40 bills in the years past, you passed 30 of them.

You were a Conservation Congress. In 188 years, we have created 176 National Parks, and you created 46 of them in five years.

You are a Consumer Congress—more than one dozen consumer bills.

You are an Anti-Poverty Congress. You are a Cities Congress. You are a Housing Congress. The greatest housing bill ever passed was passed last year.

You were a Manpower Congress, a Safe Streets Congress, an Older Americans Congress and a Transportation Congress.

There are more than a dozen accomplishments from 435 Districts. Every man from every District didn't vote for every bill, but I believe that every one of them who I knew voted for what he thought was right for his District and his country, and collectively they have written a record that I think has never been matched in all of our 188 years, and I am proud of it.

Now, I must admit that at times I have felt, as President Truman felt for a brief period, that you were a do-nothing Congress, and that you were a no-good Congress, and that you were a terrible Congress. I guess that is the way our system of government is created. We have the checks and balances and when everybody doesn't agree with the President, he doesn't feel they are as good as they ought to be.

As I leave this town, whatever mistakes have been made, I have made them or my people have made them, and I have no regrets and nothing to lay onto anyone else.

The working people of this country have been good to the President. The business people have tried to make this a better Nation. The House and Senate have helped us. They didn't make a confirmation I wanted, or ratify a treaty I wanted, but more than 500 constructive measures—sometimes they cut out or added to them, but they did their jobs as they saw fit and they did it well and they did it better in this government than any other government in all the world, in my judgment.

I don't have much patience for these people who spend all their time saying what is wrong with the Congress and what is wrong with the courts and what is wrong with the country. We have the best country in the world if we just quit talking about it.

This Congress was my home for so long. I love it so deeply and I know how it does rise to the demands of our time and I hope and pray it will continue to do so.

As Mrs. Johnson and I prepare to take our leave, as I close out our years of public service here where they began in 1931, here where my two daughters were born, where I just left my two grandchildren, where I just read a letter from Major Robb, who is coming back in May, and said "Start looking for a house in Washington," and here where I will be coming back from time to time—whether you invite me or not—I want to pay a final tribute to all of you who have been my friends.

As I look into the faces of the men and women who have been chosen to lead this

country, I want you to know that I renew my faith—my faith in the good judgment of the American people, my faith in the wisdom of the American people, and most of all my faith in the American system of which you Democrats and Republicans are such a vital part.

Mr. Speaker, to you and Carl Albert, Jerry Ford and Hale Boggs, who extended this invitation, this is a delightful occasion for me. It brings me much happiness and gladness to see all these old faces, to renew these old acquaintances, to forget these old differences and to say to each one of you, God bless you and thank you.

Mr. CARL ALBERT. Thank you, Mr. President, for one of your greatest speeches. I think it is one of the greatest you ever delivered and you have delivered many great ones.

I want to let you in on something. We have a new Member of the Democratic Leadership in Congress, but he did not get up here in time because he could not get acquainted with the Doorkeeper quick enough. Teddy Kennedy.

The SPEAKER. We want you all to have a good time. We express our sincere thanks for each and every one of you being present.

I want to express our deep and abiding feelings and sincere thanks when I say to the President and Mrs. Johnson that we are so happy that you are with us now. We are highly honored and I know I express the sentiments of all of you when I say that we hope that God will continue to bless you both for countless years to come.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous request, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOSMER, for January 8 through January 17, on account of official business in home congressional district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ZWACH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. BUTTON.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. FISHER in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in four instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT in five instances.

Mr. GIAIMO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 8, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1968. Campaign expenditures, investigate, final report on (Rept. No. 91-2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 2345. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2346. A bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act to prohibit certain corporate management interlocking relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2347. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$900 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 2348. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2349. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1890, to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the business of organized professional baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2350. A bill to amend section 3402 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., for the prosecution of veterans' claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2351. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2352. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 2353. A bill to extend the executive reorganization provisions of title 5, United States Code, for an additional 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2354. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 2355. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 2356. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2357. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to assault, resist, impede, or kill any officer or employee of the United States or the District of Columbia while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2358. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 2359. A bill to extend the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act and to increase the annual authorization for such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 2360. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide temporary assistance where public school buildings are destroyed by natural causes or fire disaster; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2361. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2362. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2363. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2364. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 25 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2365. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2366. A bill to provide social security coverage as self-employed individuals for State and local public officers, not otherwise covered under Federal-State agreement, who are paid on a fee basis by persons other than the State or local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2367. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for optometrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2368. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection

with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2370. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MESKILL (for himself, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):

H.R. 2371. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 2372. A bill to provide for the regulation of political activities of public employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2373. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2374. A bill to provide for the granting of limited preference in employment as officers or seamen aboard vessels of the United States to certain persons who served as officers and seamen aboard merchant vessels of the United States during World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 2375. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers, and certain single other persons, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 60 to 50 the age at which a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2378. A bill to provide that individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits (or child's benefits based on disability) under title II of the Social Security Act, and individuals entitled to permanent disability annuities (or child's annuities based on disability) under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2379. A bill to improve law enforcement in cities by making available funds to be used to increase police salaries and to add more police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2380. A bill to provide for a commission to select a site and plan for a Medal of Honor Hall of Fame; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2381. A bill to amend section 502 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the disability determinations for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that

payments to an individual under a public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs shall not be counted as income for pension until the amount of payments received equals the contributions thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2385. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide school lunches to children receiving aid to families with dependent children and to provide food to such families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 2387. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported raisins; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. FUQUA):

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 2389. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2390. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 so as to reduce from 6 months to 4 months the period for which daylight saving time shall be in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2391. A bill to authorize an additional 41,000 miles for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers to deduct such expenses, to arrive at their adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit Federal grants for aid to dependent children to be made thereunder even though the parents or other relatives with whom such children are living are required to perform services in a work relief program as a condition of such aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2395. A bill to protect funds invested in series E U.S. savings bonds from inflation and to encourage persons to provide for their own security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2396. A bill to increase the personal tax exemptions of a single taxpayer or head

of household from \$600 to \$1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2397. A bill to provide aid to States for roads and schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to declare any provision of law unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELBERG:

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate the increase in law violation; to determine the causes and fix responsibility for the breakdown in law enforcement, with the resulting destruction of life and property; to recommend corrective legislation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to establish the Commission for Re-establishing Constitutional Principles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall not participate in any civil action except as a party to such civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to restore to the States certain rights affected by recent Supreme Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in re the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 98. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration of programs carried on under the authority of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Res. 99. Resolution expressing the continued opposition of the House of Representatives to the admission of the Communist China regime to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 100. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 47; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 2398. A bill for the relief of Maj. John W. Hankins (U.S. Air Force, retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2399. A bill for the relief of Erika Svajda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2400. A bill for the relief of Erlinda C. deLeon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2401. A bill for the relief of Miss Nilda C. Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2402. A bill for the relief of Janice and Paget Whyte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2403. A bill for the relief of Frank Miccoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2404. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pisano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2405. A bill for the relief of Fernando Canlas Galang and his wife, Carmelita Pulido Galang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2406. A bill for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2407. A bill for the relief of Elbert C. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2408. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert L. Oertle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2409. A bill for the relief of Wynn W. Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2410. A bill for the relief of Bryce A. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2411. A bill for the relief of Lucille P. Steele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2412. A bill for the relief of Francisco and Alfonso Acerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2413. A bill for the relief of Isobel Rodriguez Berrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2414. A bill for the relief of Raul B. Rodriguez Berrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2415. A bill for the relief of Sofia Buitrago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2416. A bill for the relief of Ioro Carreiro; his wife, Olga Carreiro; and their children, Mario and Maria Carreiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2417. A bill for the relief of Roy E. Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2418. A bill for the relief of Maria Amalia Da Cruz Concalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2419. A bill for the relief of Arminda Alves DaSilva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2420. A bill for the relief of Blanca Esther Montoya Davila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2421. A bill for the relief of Nellie Hyacinth Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2422. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marianne Dierks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2423. A bill for the relief of Erasmina DiSchino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2424. A bill for the relief of Maria E. Egea and her daughter, Maria T. Egea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2425. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ashraf El-bayoumi, his wife, Soheir, and

children, Mona and Amr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:
H.R. 2426. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Esteves Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Barba Francesco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2428. A bill for the relief of Alvaro Rau'l Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2429. A bill for the relief of Martha Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Manuel Luis Hilario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2431. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Henriques and his wife, Almerinda Henriques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2432. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosemarie Huguette Labus, and her daughter, Vivian Labus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2433. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Landolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2434. A bill for the relief of Chee Mon Lau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2435. A bill for the relief of Fiorvante Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2436. A bill for the relief of Luis Enrique Linares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2437. A bill for the relief of Maria Do Santo Cristo Se Souza Maiato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2438. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Giorgio Mancinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2439. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Mancinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Luis Botelho Motta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Ferdinando Neola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2442. A bill for the relief of Roger Pasimio and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2443. A bill for the relief of Stephen Pearson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2444. A bill for the relief of Francesco Pecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2445. A bill for the relief of Angelo M. Pettito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2446. A bill for the relief of Felice Angelo Pettito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2447. A bill for the relief of Jose Joaquim Rezendes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2448. A bill for the relief of Nocera Rocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2449. A bill for the relief of Degennaro Sabato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2450. A bill for the relief of Vincent Suriano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Carmela Tarantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2452. A bill for the relief of Nicola Tarzia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2453. A bill for the relief of Miss Franca Tolusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2454. A bill for the relief of Antonio Trinchese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Jose Valadao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Nino and Maria Theresa Vespa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 2457. A bill for the relief of M. Shawky A. A. Hammam, Fathia Hammam, Nadia

Hammam, Sonia Hammam, Mona Hammam, and Magda Hammam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Enright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Maria Signorello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Basilia F. Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 2461. A bill for the relief of Mabel Alice Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2462. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Palacano Di Pietro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Chalom Elbaz, his wife, Esther Elbaz, and their four minor children, Annette Elbaz, Jacob Elbaz, Meyer Elbaz, and Mokhlouf Elbaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2464. A bill for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2465. A bill for the relief of Antonio Garcia Sola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 2466. A bill for the relief of Rocco Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2467. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 2468. A bill for the relief of Mrs.

Latife Hassan Mahmoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Danilo Magadia Aguila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2470. A bill for the relief of Manuel J. Vicent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2471. A bill for the relief of James B. Billingsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2472. A bill for the relief of Klaudiusz Blaszk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Antonio Boluna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2474. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Burdon L. Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2475. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah W. Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2476. A bill for the relief of Erna Maria Demil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2477. A bill for the relief of Comdr. John N. Green, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2478. A bill for the relief of William N. Hilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Adelajda Komarnicka-Smieja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Joe R. Lacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Comdr. John W. McCord; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2482. A bill for the relief of Ran-

dolph M. Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2483. A bill for the relief of Jamshed Dhunjisha Mavalwala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2484. A bill for the relief of Francisco Moreno-Santa Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Amos E. Norby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2486. A bill for the relief of Atanasio Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2488. A bill for the relief of Shahzadeh Shiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Perla Janolino Ty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2490. A bill for the relief of Jesus Vasquez-Rivas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2491. A bill for the relief of Paul A. Vieira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2492. A bill for the relief of Herta Margarete Helene Monden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 2493. A bill for the relief of Mieczyslaw J. Gurne and his wife, Daniela Gurne, and their child, Ewa D. Gurne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 101. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 2217) entitled "A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Harris," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IT'S HAPPY BIRTHDAY FOR MEMPHIS

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to invite my colleagues and the people of America to come to Memphis, Tenn., this year and help us celebrate our 150th anniversary. Memphis' Sesquicentennial Year was kicked off yesterday with first day ceremonies for the sesquicentennial medallion. We were honored to have as our guest for this historic occasion, Miss Eva Adams, Director of the U.S. Mint.

It is my privilege to represent the greater part of Memphis, a city which has played a leading role in the history of our country for a century and a half. We are a forward looking community where progress has been a hallmark.

Like all metropolitan areas, we have our problems, but thanks to the Memphis spirit of cooperation and neighborliness we are making tremendous strides in solving them. Industry is finding Memphis a good place to locate because of the availability of a reservoir of the finest type of workers. We are a city of beautiful homes and we are now making concentrated efforts to improve the homes of all our people. We were the first city in the Nation to establish and put into operation a program to make

it possible for those of limited income to become homeowners. This project, Housing Opportunity, Memphis Enterprises—HOME—sponsored by civic and business leaders is already constructing in excess of 100 homes, many of them already occupied by low-income families.

Memphis is known around the world for its contributions to medicine. Our hospital complex and medical research facilities are second to none. The contributions of those engaged in this field are already giving new life and new hope to sufferers of leukemia, cancer, and other diseases.

Yes, it is happy birthday to Memphis. We will be celebrating all year. You will find a visit to Memphis rewarding, enjoyable, and I predict that many who come for a visit will do as thousands of others have done, stay permanently.

The following editorial and news article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal tell a little of the Memphis story:

MEMPHIS PACE QUICKENS

Memphis comes into its sesquicentennial year on a fast rising tide of business throughout the huge area it serves.

Summaries published today in The Commercial Appeal's Business and Industrial Review bring together accomplishments of 1968. The scorecard is impressive for its own sake and for the momentum with which the new year starts.

One of the brightest parts of the picture is development of Memphis as the distribution center for the South. Full use of the city's potential in position and in superior transportation is beginning to appear, as a story by Louis Silver points out through interviews

with businessmen who have put it to work. One of the quotations say it this way:

"Large companies are determining that Memphis is a logical location because it lies between Atlanta and Dallas and can serve the Southeast and the Southwest as opposed to having two distribution centers—one in Dallas and one in Atlanta."

We have a distinctive advantage in the Mississippi River location and we are using it more all the time. River traffic has reached the level that means a towboat, pushing an average of 10 barges, coming into Memphis at the rate of one for each hour of day and night.

As the year ended the Little Rock Pine Bluff bends of the Arkansas River were added to the towboat routes.

In contrast with the oldest form of transportation we have a modern airport where the biggest problem is expanding runways and terminal space as fast as business flies in.

New industrial plants continue to flower in the favorable climate of the Mid-South. Two of the big ones are the Goodyear tire plant at Union City, Tenn., and announcement of an agrochemical plant for the CIBA Corp. in De Soto County, Miss.

What these new plants mean in pay rolls and the flow of cash takes on a multiplied importance when we examine the expansions of operations which have flourished in Memphis area conditions. An addition is less spectacular than a new plant, but it may bring a larger impact on business. One instance is the Ivers & Pond Piano Co., the nation's largest piano manufacturer, which put a branch in Memphis and then moved headquarters here. Another is the Goodyear plant, which aimed for daily production of 17,500 tires and shifted to 30,000 before the original plant was complete.

In the heart of the region, Memphis and Shelby County residents got almost 3,500

new apartments and more than 3,000 new homes during the year, despite difficult conditions in the mortgage money market.

Beyond the promise of 1968 accomplishments for 1969, we have something special at work in the four million dollars put into the Greater Memphis Program of the Memphis Area Chamber of Commerce. It is a higher level of effort than ever before undertaken in this 150-year-old city.

IT'S HAPPY BIRTHDAY TIME IN MEMPHIS

Memphis began celebrating its 150th birthday last Tuesday night and the city's drum-beating outfit—Memphis Sesquicentennial, Inc.—is busy in generating interest in the Bluff City on a national scale.

One of the organization's first efforts was to ask about 200 cities to send Memphis congratulatory birthday candles. Most of those received reflect something of the character of the donor city.

Detroit's modernistic candle bears the motif of the gears of industry. Jersey City sent a replica of the Statue of Liberty which is located in New York Harbor opposite the New Jersey city. Tucson sent a Saguaro candle, representing one of the nation's few living national monuments.

From Huntsville, Ala., came a rocket-shaped candle. Dayton's contribution is more unusual—a walnut plaque, bearing a blue candle, representative of sky and space, and a gilded reproduction of the Wright Brother's first airplane.

Dubbed the "World's Champion Candle" is the one manufactured for Kansas City by Hallmark Cards of that city. This three-foot candle is a work of art, containing 18 stained glass windows and covered with an intricate, antique filigree. It took four artists four months to make the candle. Pictures of the Kansas City effort, with a story about the Memphis anniversary celebration, have appeared in 215 newspapers.

For months, the Memphis Sesquicentennial group has been receiving advance orders from all over the country for the Memphis Sesquicentennial Medallion which Congress authorized to be struck by the United States Mint at Philadelphia, Pa. This is the first medal of its size—larger than a silver dollar—to be struck on the mint's coin press.

After an initial production of 10,000 silver medallions, a second silver run of 10,000 will be ordered if demand warrants. Continued demand will be filled with up to 80,000 bronze medallions. This will be the sesquicentennial's prime fund-raising projects.

Issuing of a W. C. Handy commemorative stamp by the Post Office Department will be a major accomplishment this year. Sesquicentennial officials look on the stamps as generating more publicity for Memphis although Uncle Sam gets the revenue from stamp sales.

As many as 500,000 first day covers bearing the stamp and postmarked in Memphis will be sold on the day the stamp is issued. Notable figures from the music and entertainment worlds are expected here for the first day ceremonies.

The stamp, which honors W. C. Handy as "The Father of the Blues," will be the first United States postage stamp honoring a contemporary form of music, the first recognizing a composer of such music, the first in honor of a Negro musician and composer and the fifth to honor a Negro.

Millions of persons this year will see the official sesquicentennial mural in color—2¼ inches by 8½ inches—on the back of business envelopes. Tension Envelope Corp. commissioned the envelope with the cooperation of about 200 Memphis lithographers, printers and paper houses. The paper will come from a Tennessee mill.

As many as 10 million envelopes may be manufactured.

A sesquicentennial patch, embroidered in color for wearing on uniforms and blazers,

will be issued for use by anyone who will wear them—band and athletic team members including the Memphis Blues, service station attendants, and hotel and motel porters.

Wurzburg Bros. will produce the sesquicentennial symbol suitable for affixing to almost any surface.

The Tennessee Poetry Society is organizing the publication of a 2,000-copy of an anthology of poems by Memphis poets during the year-long celebration.

AMBASSADORS OF GOOD WILL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 3, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article describing the Christmas message of the three astronauts in which they read the first 10 verses from Genesis and which included Colonel Borman's prayer for peace. How many people in various nations around the world watched the satellite transmission of this inspiring episode is hard to estimate. However, the press of the world brought to countless millions the account of the flight of Apollo 8 in its breathless trip around the moon. This epic adventure must have struck a chord of admiration in the hearts of many throughout the world, as three courageous Americans dared to enter regions never before traveled by denizens of earth.

The Daily Record, of Wooster, Ohio, in an editorial on December 28, 1968, advanced a proposal with a people-to-people theme which certainly has merit:

Secondly, these heroic men should be given a new assignment—to rove this planet east and west, north and south, touching every land, touching every people. By their heroism these men have become uniquely qualified to become permanent Ambassadors At Large for the great free nation that is their homeland.

To be sure, we now have a unique opportunity to impress upon peoples of the free world the realization that the United States is forward moving in the realm of science while maintaining the religious tenets of the past. Surely, sincere people the world over can be shown that American military men are sincere in praying for peace for they make the greatest sacrifices in war. Finally, the presence of our astronauts among peoples of free nations would stress perhaps most poignantly the hope of the United States for a peaceful conquest of space, but that we have no intention of succumbing to militantly atheistic ideologies here on earth.

I include the editorial, "Borman, Lovell, Anders Deserve Ambassador Status," from the Daily Record, of Wooster, Ohio, in the RECORD at this point:

BORMAN, LOVELL, ANDERS DESERVE AMBASSADOR STATUS

The three Men From Earth who first went around the moon, seeking where no man had ever sought before, are the sons of a highly creative planet.

Almost every nook and cranny, every isle and continent, has contributed work, ideas and techniques which have blended into the

main stream of this incredible century, now two-thirds consumed.

Whatever their names, their nation, their identities—these three men represent an achievement for all men.

As a nation, it might be well for us to consider new opportunities and challenges for these lunar astronauts.

These men should not be asked to take more such risks. Gratefully, we (as a nation) should disqualify them from further space service—they have done enough.

Secondly, these heroic men should be given a new assignment—to rove this planet east and west, north and south, touching every land, touching every people. By their heroism these men have become uniquely qualified to become permanent Ambassadors At Large for the great free nation that is their homeland.

Let them go everywhere—of course with their families—and report back instantly to President Nixon, the Congress and the American people. Let them tell others what we are like and, most important of all, what we want to be.

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, now that the holidays are over and students are flocking back to college campuses all over the country I suppose we should brace ourselves for another rash of demonstrations and other "tomfoolery" which was so prevalent during the fall term.

One aspect of these incidents which has been so disturbing to me is the attitude and actions of many faculty members who have aided and abetted a small minority of so-called students in their disruptive tactics. This point is the subject of an excellent editorial appearing in the December 19, 1968, edition of the Peoria Journal Star, entitled "Faculty Responsibility" and I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

We wonder how much of the "student rebellion" we see at so many colleges today is really faculty inspired.

Over and over the news reports mention splits in the faculty when the students are up in arms. Sometimes the whole dispute arises from a faculty decision in regard to the dismissal of a teacher. And there is a striking similarity between what we hear students saying about "student rights" and what some young teachers are saying about "academic rights."

We have the feeling that there is a much larger connection than the one which meets the eye between "student unrest" and the vicious in-fighting over professional standing which has to be taking place in some faculties.

An example of the kind of private backbiting which goes on in some faculties came out of MIT last week when it was revealed that Walt Whitman Rostow, after having served the nation as the key foreign policy advisor to President Johnson, could not get his teaching job back. The story was that MIT's faculty committees decided they couldn't fit him back in.

Such a conclusion is beyond normal understanding. It makes some sense if you realize that great jealousies exist over the top teaching jobs in the nation, now that the pay has become lucrative and the positions

have become stepping stones to public acclaim and governmental recognition. It makes even more sense if you know that great power over who will teach and who won't teach at a particular university has been vested in the hands of faculty committees rather than the university administration.

What we seem to be witnessing now in the inability of so many college administrations and boards of trustees to settle disputes with students must be due in some measure to the diminishing of power at the top as a result of the transfer of so much authority to slow-acting faculty committees and the rise of some teachers to positions of prominence far above that which normally attaches to their jobs.

It is possible today at Bradley University, for example, for a young teacher to start his teaching "career" as an "advisor" to a militant student group and by concentrating on this "extra-curricular" activity become overnight one of the most "prominent" members of the faculty (at least in the eyes of the students he leads). When the young teacher is told that the university is unhappy with his teaching, the stage is clearly set for a "student rebellion."

It is possible, given to conditions which exist on so many campuses today, for a teacher or a group of teachers to "use" the eagerness of some students to take up any cause that comes down the pike. We wonder how many of the "student petitions" which complain about the performance of a dean or university president are in reality well-concealed faculty efforts to embarrass or get rid of some of the competition for advancement.

Of course, we do not know how much of this kind of stuff is taking place, but we do know that the growing decentralization of authority serves to increase the incidence of it.

Plainly, a cry of foul will arise from professional groups all over the nation when serious steps are finally taken to reverse this erosion of power at the top in the universities. The phrase "academic freedom" will ring out louder and louder as teachers see themselves being called upon to "get into line" themselves in order to bring their rebellious students back to their senses.

We respect "academic freedom" in the honest meaning of the phrase, but we have no use for the way it has been redefined to mean "student cheerleading" by some young teachers who have no idea of the really rugged in-fighting the older hands on their faculties have gone through to raise the status of college teaching to where it is today.

It seems to us that some of these older hands would be doing their profession another good deed if they took some of their militant young colleagues aside and explained to them that they are now teachers themselves and that they ought to act like them instead of problem students.

If this doesn't begin to happen, it will only be a matter of time before the administrators and trustees, particularly of public-supported universities, begin to harshly reassert their responsibilities and step on some real academic freedoms in the process.

ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my resolution, House Joint Resolution 1, to change the method of

electing the President of the United States, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Long Island Press for December 27, 1968.

The editorial succinctly states the legislation which I am sponsoring, along with my colleagues, Mr. SIKES, of Florida; Mr. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii; and Mr. WOLFF, of New York.

The editorial follows:

ELECTORAL REFORM

As the Electoral College last week exercised its quadrennial function by ratifying Richard Nixon's election as President, it vividly displayed one of its dangerous defects.

One of the North Carolina electors, chosen by voters who preferred Richard Nixon, disregarded their wishes and cast his vote for George C. Wallace. It was quite legal under the Constitution, which is another compelling reason for amending the Constitutional procedure for electing the President.

The system also permits a candidate to win a majority of the electoral votes, and thus the Presidency, while receiving a minority of the popular vote. And by requiring a majority in the electoral college, the system makes possible a deadlock, with the choice of the President thrown into the House of Representatives where delay and political haggling could bring chaos down on the country.

A number of new amendments are expected when the 91st Congress convenes in January. One of the more interesting will be introduced by Louisiana Democrat Hale Boggs, majority whip. It does not eliminate all the defects, but it ends the possibility of electors ignoring the desires of the voters and diminishes other potential dangers.

Under Rep. Boggs' plan, the President would still be selected by a tally of electoral votes, rather than popular votes, but the electoral college itself would be abolished. A state's electoral votes—one for each Representative and Senator it has—would go automatically to the Presidential candidate who won a plurality of popular votes in that state. There would be no Presidential Electors who could substitute their judgment for the mandate of the public. And instead of requiring a majority of electoral votes to elect a President, as now, any plurality in excess of 40 per cent would be sufficient under the amendment.

The amendment would authorize Congress to provide procedures to be followed if a candidate dies or withdraws before the election, or in case of a tie.

The modest nature of changes in Rep. Boggs' amendment may be its virtue, not its weakness. Bolder, more sweeping revisions—particularly those that call for direct popular election of the President—have invariably wound up on the junk heap. Many states are reluctant to relinquish the federalist procedure in which each state has a distinct voice in selecting the President. Rep. Boggs' amendment meets that problem. It demands no abrupt, radical change, yet offers a system which is a distinct improvement over the absurd, troublesome anachronism we have now.

AMERICA'S HERITAGE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this Congress it is important to remember our heritage and those beliefs

which have underscored the development of our great Nation. There have been many sources of great inspiration for all Americans, and I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three statements which have meant much to us through the years.

They are "An American," by that great statesman and legislator, Daniel Webster; "The American's Creed" by a former Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, William Tyler Page; and the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," authored by Francis Bellamy:

AN AMERICAN

(By Daniel Webster)

I was born an American; I will live an American. I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. I mean to do this with absolute disregard of personal consequences. What are the personal consequences? What is the individual man, with all the good or evil that may befall him, in comparison with the good or evil which may befall a great country, and in the midst of great transactions which concern that country's fate? Let the consequences be what they will, I am careless. No man can suffer too much, and no man can fall too soon, if he suffer, or if he fall in the defense of the liberties and constitution of his country.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

(By Francis Bellamy)

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

GOOD ADVICE ON TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, an extremely sound analysis of the national transportation system's problems—and what the Congress and the administration might consider in dealing with them—is provided in an excellent recent speech by one of the industry's most respected spokesmen, Charles A. Webb.

Mr. Webb, a former Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission who is now the president of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners, drew high praise for this thorough speech from the editor of Transportation & Dis-

tribution Management magazine, who editorialized in its December 1968, issue:

Before it takes the unfinished business of the last Congress before the 91st Congress, the transportation industry should commit itself to what Mr. Webb refers to as "the first law of political action" . . . that total victory for one segment of the transportation industry with total defeat for another is intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that Mr. Webb's speech—delivered last November 14 in Philadelphia before a joint meeting of the New England Bus Association, the Intercity Bus Association of New York State and the Northeastern Bus Traffic Association—drew wide favorable response in the entire transportation industry, as well.

Because of its import, I include here as part of my remarks the text of the speech, along with the editorial by George A. Gecowets from the December Transportation & Distribution Management:

REMARKS OF CHARLES A. WEBB, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MOTOR BUS OWNERS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE JOINT MEETING, NEW ENGLAND BUS ASSOCIATION, INTERCITY BUS ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK STATE, NORTHEASTERN BUS TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION, HOTEL SHERATON, PHILADELPHIA, PA., NOVEMBER 14, 1968

It is a real pleasure and a distinct privilege to speak to the joint membership meeting of three important intercity bus associations. It is also a considerable challenge to make any meaningful report from Washington on the eve of a new Administration and a new Congress.

Transportation legislation to be considered in the 91st Congress may be inferred, to some extent, from the unfinished business of the last Congress. We do not know what transportation problems the new Administration will undertake to solve, but we may surmise it will deal with some which have been widely regarded as chronic or critical.

Regulation of domestic surface transportation is characterized by inequality of competitive opportunity. That incontestable and indefensible fact must be of primary concern to any Administration which desires to strengthen our national transportation system. It is also a problem in which common carriers have a common legislative interest and one which, in my opinion, can be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of the competing modes.

The new Department of Transportation of the outgoing Administration apparently did not have time to draft a detailed plan for the elimination of regulatory inequities. Judging by the trial balloons floated by several of its officials, however, it leaned strongly toward the view that equality of competitive opportunity should be achieved by massive deregulation. Implicit in this view is that the motor carrier industry possesses no public utility characteristics; that the industry is so strong as to render futile any campaign of destructive rate competition; that controls over entry and controls over financial transactions are anachronisms bred during the Great Depression, and that, therefore, the elimination or relaxation of all such controls will result in more economical and more efficient motor carrier service.

Although wholesale deregulation would eliminate regulatory inequalities and is strongly urged by many respected economists, the approach has not been politically realistic at any time during the past two decades and does not appear to be so today. No major legislation is likely to be passed if it represents a total victory for one mode of transportation and a humiliating defeat for equally important segments of the industry. For

surface transportation, this should be the First Law of Political Action.

A more promising solution to the problem of regulatory inequality is to make regulation more comprehensive by restricting or repealing the exemptions which create inequality of competitive opportunity. For example, if repeal of the agricultural and bulk commodities exemptions is undesirable or not feasible, the inequities caused by these exemptions could be alleviated by a mild form of regulation for changed rates and new entrants. This approach to regulatory reform would require on the part of all concerned a willingness to compromise and a determination not to let their notions of what is perfect defeat what would be manifestly better than the present chaotic patchwork of regulation.

In the area of promotional responsibility, the new Administration will be confronted with at least three major problems in which the intercity bus industry has a direct and substantial interest. The progressive deterioration and discontinuance of railroad passenger train service have spawned a variety of schemes for subsidy. The present Administration has resisted these proposals on the logical ground that the public's reaction to the improved service planned for the Northeast Corridor ought first to be evaluated. NAMBO undoubtedly will oppose any legislation to subsidize intercity rail passenger service which is not economically viable. In any study which seeks to determine what part of the remaining intercity service is "essential," we will ask for an opportunity to show the extent to which intercity bus service is an adequate substitute for rail passenger service.

Secondly, the new Administration may be expected to take a fresh look at the Federal-aid highway program and, especially, at the highly vocal opposition to urban highway development and construction. The bus industry—both the intercity and transit segments—will suffer if the anti-freeway clause prevails. Highway users have already been harmed by the fiscal gimmickry involved in sporadic withholding of the use of funds collected for highway construction. Even greater delays in highway construction, and consequent higher costs, would flow from adoption of the pending DOT proposal to make each highway construction project the subject of formal and extensive hearings.

Finally, the new Administration must deal with the truly awesome problems of urban mass transportation. From now until the end of the century, an Administration's record on transportation is apt to be judged primarily on the basis of its success in arresting or reversing the trend toward urban immobility. Urban roads cannot be multiphased indefinitely in response to an uncontrolled proliferation of automobiles. Public transportation in urban areas must be made so attractive that private transportation during peak travel hours will be a less-desirable alternative. Stated differently, every rider of public transportation in our large metropolitan areas must be assured swift, unimpeded access to the central city.

Rail transit service is feasible in only a relatively few large cities. Development of modern rapid transit bus systems involving exclusive or preferential use of highway lanes appears to be the most promising solution. This is a program that merits the full support of all segments of the bus industry. The cooperation of individual bus operators and their State and local associations is particularly important because local communities necessarily have a large voice in urban transportation planning.

Turning now to the next Congress, a prediction of its major transportation concerns is hazardous. With some justification, the 90th Congress was sometimes called the Consumer's Congress. There is no reason to suppose that its interest in consumer-type legislation has diminished. Accordingly, I would

expect the next Congress to give active consideration to the bill providing for an award of attorney's fees to litigants who prevail in transportation loss or damage actions brought under Section 20(11) of the Interstate Commerce Act. In the last Congress we were successful in having the attorney's fee bill amended in the Senate Commerce Committee to eliminate the most serious objections of the intercity bus industry.

In the field of motor carrier safety, the Congress in 1966 enacted legislation which made the authority of the Department of Transportation virtually complete. The Congress will continue to be concerned with motor carrier safety but this concern is likely to be manifested in oversight and appropriation hearings rather than in the form of new motor vehicle safety legislation.

One important piece of unfinished business is legislation which would increase the maximum size and weight of vehicles permitted to use the Interstate System. The intercity bus industry must provide greater comfort for its passengers by installing wider seats. This can only be done if the maximum width of buses permitted to use the Interstate System is increased from 96 to 102 inches. The merits of our case have been recognized by the Federal Highway Administration, the American Association of State Highway Officials and by most, if not all, experts on highway safety. I hope that hearings on vehicle size and weight legislation will be held early in the next Congress so that supporters of the bill can rebut on the record the misrepresentations leveled at S. 2658 after its passage by the Senate and after the close of hearings before the House Public Works and Rules Committees.

Since I am privileged to share your platform with Commissioner Wallace R. Burke, I am reluctant to comment on matters before the Interstate Commerce Commission which our industry regards as important or to speculate on other matters of more general transportation importance. However, I do want to emphasize that the Commission's role in creating a strong national transportation system is vitally important but in some danger of being obscured by the much larger, newer, and to some minds, more glamorous Department of Transportation. So instead of thinking about what the Commission can do for us, let us think briefly about what we can do for the Commission.

Due to lack of funds, the Commission has been unable to handle promptly hotly contested applications for operating authority. For lack of adequate staff assistance, some merger cases have become trials by endurance. Illegal motor carriers of property and passengers are allowed to roam the highways in increasing numbers, sapping the financial strength of regulated, law-abiding carriers. Yet the staff of the Commission has been so unrealistically reduced that the time being devoted to curbing these unlawful operations is less today than at any time in recent years. The least we can do is to couple our complaints about Commission action or inaction in particular cases with acclaim for its over-all performance.

The Commission's so-called "image" has never been as good outside the circle of transportation as it deserves to be. We ought to explain to all who will listen the relationship between economic regulation and carrier earning power. If the vital cycle of earnings, growth, and investment is broken, we will not have the transport capacity required to meet the needs of a steadily expanding economy.

In these remarks, I have dealt in rather piecemeal fashion with transportation problems that may be faced by a new Administration, a new Congress, and by DOT and ICC. Actually, the problems are not likely to be resolved in any satisfactory manner unless there is full cooperation among all the governmental agencies concerned.

In view of the magnitude and the complexity of the task, it might be well to con-

clude these remarks by referring to some first principles of transportation upon which widespread agreement is essential.

At no time during my transportation experience have I seen any statement of National Transportation Policy which is an improvement on that declared by the Congress in the Transportation Act of 1940. If all Federal departments and agencies were directed to conduct their transportation activities so as to further the objectives of that National Transportation Policy, some of our major transportation problems would be at least partially solved.

Reasonable men may differ on how to solve the problem of inequality of competitive opportunity but such inequality should not be permitted to continue. Reasonable men differ on how to end discriminatory State and local tax assessments on carrier property but the continuation of such discrimination should have no defenders.

Transportation legislation, regulation, and promotion should move in step with technological advances so that carriers may pass along the benefits of improved technology to shippers and passengers.

The common problems of common carriers are of far greater importance than the differences which sometimes divide them into warring factions. When this fact is fully recognized, we can look toward the development of a sound, fully coordinated system for the movement of people and goods and one which makes optimum use of existing transport capacity.

Finally, the task of improving domestic surface transportation might well begin by discarding the phrase, "transportation crisis." It is hyperbole which flies in the teeth of the fact that our privately owned transportation system, despite its imperfections, is still the envy of the world.

THE FIRST LAW OF POLITICAL ACTION

A couple of months ago we mentioned that the transportation industry is, in many respects, an industry divided against itself. It is made up of several interest groups—shippers, carriers, suppliers, investors—that form interacting alliances against each other to resolve specific issues that affect the industry as a whole.

Charles A. Webb, president of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners and past chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, picked up this theme in a recent speech and suggested that now is the time for the transportation industry to face certain facts and work itself out of the dilemma of regulatory inequality. He suggested that the warring factions within the industry should quit fooling around with so-called solutions that are not politically realistic and concentrate on those problems in which they have a common legislative interest.

"We do not know what transportation problems the new Administration will undertake to solve," he said, "but we may surmise it will deal with some which have been widely regarded as chronic or critical."

"Regulation of domestic surface transportation is characterized by inequality of competitive opportunity. That incontestable and indefensible fact must be of primary concern to any Administration which desires to strengthen our national transportation system. It is also a problem in which common carriers have a common legislative interest and one which, in my opinion, can be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of the competing modes."

"Reasonable men may differ on how to solve the problem of inequality of competitive opportunity, but such inequality should not be permitted to continue."

"Reasonable men differ on how to end discriminatory state and local tax assessments on carrier property, but the continuation of such discrimination should have no defenders."

"Transportation legislation, regulation and promotion should move in step with tech-

nological advances so that carriers may pass along the benefits of improved technology to shippers and passengers."

"The common problems of common carriers are of far greater importance than the differences which sometimes divide them into warring factions."

"When this is fully recognized, we can look toward the development of a sound, fully coordinated system for the movement of people and goods and one which makes optimum use of existing transport capacity."

Although wholesale deregulation would eliminate regulatory inequalities, Mr. Webb feels that this approach is not politically realistic. He feels that a more promising solution to the problem is to make regulation more comprehensive by restricting or repealing some of the exemptions which create inequality or competitive opportunity. He suggests, for example, that if repeal of the agricultural and bulk commodities exemptions is not feasible, the inequities caused by these exemptions could be alleviated by a mild new form of regulation for changing rates and for allowing new entrants into the exempt transportation business. Such an approach to regulatory reform would require a willingness to compromise on the part of all concerned.

Before it takes the unfinished business of the last Congress before the 91st Congress, the transportation industry should commit itself to what Mr. Webb refers to as "the first law of political action" . . . that total victory for one segment of the transportation industry with total defeat for another is intolerable. If the transportation industry doesn't pay heed to this law, and soon, it will get even less attention from the 91st Congress than it did from the 90th.

BIG POWERS MUST ACT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to receive from three of my constituents—the members of the firm of David, Rubenstein & Toback, chartered, certified public accountants, of Phoenix, Ariz. the following editorial "Big Powers Must Act." Because of their concern over the volatile situation in the Middle East, they sent this editorial to me air mail, special delivery with a letter which included the following statements:

We have discussed the Israeli-Arab situation with dozens of people and the consensus of opinion of most Arizonans seems to be reflected perfectly by the editorial in the Tuesday, December 31, 1968 edition of the Arizona Republic—Since you are a fellow Arizonan of high authority, we beseech you to add your voice to that of your constituents and let the White House and the United Nations know our feeling.

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to do so by inserting this excellent editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

BIG POWERS MUST ACT

A new and fertile field for U.N. action has opened in the Middle East. Russia, the United States, France and Britain have all condemned the Israeli army raid on Beirut's international airport. If they will act together, they can defuse the powder keg which threatens to explode in another Jewish-Arab war. If they fail to act, one reprisal can be expected to follow another in the cockpit of the Middle East.

There can be no justification in interna-

tional law for the Israeli attack on the Beirut airport. Israeli soldiers were flown across the border of Lebanon in Israeli army helicopters Saturday night. They landed on the Beirut airport, moved methodically to destroy Lebanese planes and hangars, then climbed aboard the helicopters and went home. Thirteen planes belonging to Lebanon Middle East Airlines, worth perhaps \$50 million, were demolished. The next day Israeli jets flew a reconnaissance mission over the airport just to make sure the commandos had done their job.

This, quite clearly, was an act of war. It made a mockery of all talk about peace on earth, good will to men. And yet it cannot be considered as an isolated event. It stemmed directly from an attack by two Arab terrorists against an Israeli passenger plane in Athens, Greece.

Two Palestinian Arabs, trained in demolition at a refugee camp in Lebanon, went to Greece to destroy the El-Al plane. They murdered an Israeli passenger in the process. While the Israelis demolished 13 planes for one, they apparently killed no one in the Beirut raid.

Airliners are particularly vulnerable to international blackmail, as nearly a score of American pilots have learned when they have been forced to fly to Havana. Earlier in the year an El-Al plane was hi-jacked over Italy and flown to Algiers, where the Jewish crew and plane were kept for a week before being turned loose.

If Israeli passenger planes are going to be subjected to hi-jacking and machine gun attacks every time they leave home, it is obvious that the El-Al Airline will soon go out of business. Arab nations apparently think they can recruit, train and finance the saboteurs, then wash their hands of the consequences. The raid on Beirut proves the falsity of this thinking.

But as Israel should know, one reprisal leads to another. An Arab attack on a Jewish position can be expected, and it presumably will be followed by an Israeli attack on an Arab position. It is to avoid this sort of escalation, which will lead inevitably to a general conflict, that the U.N. must now act.

The basis for an Arab-Jewish settlement is well known. The Arab states must agree to recognize Israel as a sovereign nation. The Jews must agree to return the territories—or at least most of them—taken in the Six Day war. Each party must be forced to respect the international rights of the other.

No one is going to make the Jews and the Arabs love each other—not in the lifetime of any person now living. But the four great powers, which have a lot at stake in the Middle East, can force them to live with each other in relative peace. This is the time for the U.N. to show its real ability as an instrument of world order.

TAXPAYERS SUBSIDIZE WELFARE REVOLTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, charity is to be now compromised to include robbery of taxpayers.

American taxpayers now experience such forces as guaranteed charity—forced charity without residence requirements or even getting to know the people who do the work to foot the bill.

Nor is welfare food alone—it now includes attorneys, paid at taxpayers expense, to advise the recipients how to beat the giver. Welfare even includes

the funds to promote the recipients into militant bands of activists.

This is one reason why the American people must never permit a national welfare program. Charity must be an act of love from people to people—otherwise it is just plain extortion.

I insert letters from the Louisiana welfare director and news clippings, as follows:

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Baton Rouge, November 25, 1968.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: In view of the recent Welfare sit-ins in the Orleans Parish Offices, I thought you would be interested in the attached article from the Dallas Morning News. You will note the contribution being made by the Office of Economic Opportunity in this article. This same organization, I have been informed, supported and encouraged the sit-ins in our local offices in Orleans. Information furnished us by the police in Orleans and a Taxi driver established the fact that OEO funds were used to transport these demonstrators to our offices.

Sincerely yours,

GARLAND L. BONIN,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

NOVEMBER 27, 1968.

HON. JOHN J. McKEITHEN,
Governor, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge,
La.

DEAR GOVERNOR McKEITHEN: I recently advised you of the sit-ins by Welfare mothers sponsored by Welfare Rights Organizations in our various offices in the parish of Orleans.

We now have information that in addition to sit-ins in the local offices and attacks on the local office itself, this group plans to direct its hostilities against individual workers, even to go so far as physical violence. This information has been furnished me through sources that I consider completely reliable. For this reason, I have temporarily suspended home visits in the Housing Projects in Orleans Parish. This step is taken in order to protect our workers from violence. As soon as the situation clears up and I am assured that our workers will be safe, these visits will be resumed.

I am still of the opinion that the welfare situation in New Orleans is explosive and dangerous and anything could happen. This is, in my opinion, not the fault of the Welfare Department or our rules and regulations as such insofar as the clients themselves are concerned, however, the Welfare Rights groups, which are both directly and indirectly supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity funds which have been appropriated by the United States Congress, has convinced these people that they do have grievances and the way to resolve them is through violence. Their objective is to wreck the Welfare program as it exists today.

I will keep you advised of any further developments.

Sincerely yours,

GARLAND L. BONIN,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

DISRUPT HOLIDAY TRADE, WELFARE PATRONS
URGED

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—In Webster's Dictionary, the verb "to conspire" is defined, "to join in a secret agreement to do an unlawful or wrongful act or to use such means to accomplish a lawful end." The noun "conspiracy" is defined as "the act of conspiring together; an agreement among conspirators."

On Thursday evening, November 7, 1968, in the Broadway United Church of Christ at 211 West 56th Street, New York City, there took place a meeting of conspirators acting in

agreement to do unlawful, wrongful acts on a nationwide basis in the month of December 1968. The meeting was attended by political and legal "coordinators" conspiring with welfare recipients to break the law. For example, they conspired to create a public nuisance through disruption of Christmas shopping at big department stores next month.

WELFARE OFFICIALS

The coordinators present in the church meeting are members of the Citywide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups in New York City, a group that has repeatedly staged unlawful demonstrations. Under the ideological tutelage of Drs. Richard A. Cloward and Frances Piven of the Columbia University School of Social Work, the Citywide Coordinating Committee is led by Hulbert James and by Mrs. Beulah Sanders, a Negro "welfare mother" whose loud ranting before the Democratic Platform Committee last August scandalized Chairman Hale Boggs and millions of TV viewers.

After some discussion concerning the conspirators' December program, a "coordinator" described the December department store program. "You recruit people on welfare to go pick out what they want—about a hundred dollars worth—and go to the cash register at May's or Macy's or Abraham & Straus. First you demand a discount. They won't give it to you. Then you demand credit. They won't give it to you. Meantime, you're holding up the store's business."

CHARGE TO WELFARE

"When the cashier demands that you pay, you say 'Charge it to Welfare.' This will start up a big argument. People with Christmas shopping will be waiting in line to pay at the cash register. We can drive a lot of angry customers away from the store. Meantime, the cashier has got to send for the manager. Before any new purchases can be rung up, the whole register has got to be gone over."

"The customers get madder and madder. The store calls for the police. The cops come and we put up a struggle. Don't worry. We'll take care of the legal appeals when you get arrested. You put up a struggle and we'll get some people planted in the store to be very upset customers shocked at police brutality to welfare mothers just trying to get something for their kids for Christmas. You can bet May's and Macy's and A&S owners will put the heat on the city to get us out of the place because it's bad for business and get the city to give us what we want. We'll raise such hell they'll do anything to get peace. They'll charge you with creating a public nuisance. A few of you will be arrested and they'll let the rest go. Our friends that Cloward and Piven send us will take care of things. Just you take care of your angle and Columbia will take care of the legal angle. You try it and see. You'll get what you want."

SUBSIDIZED BY OEO

A law student at Columbia University Center for Social Welfare Policy and Law, Jonathan Marsh, briefed the coordinators on the need for getting recruits to fill out papers to back up appeals cases for arrested welfare demonstrators. The Center recently received a subsidy from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The conspiring coordinators of the Citywide Committee in New York are coordinating their work with the National Welfare Rights Organization in Washington, D.C. Before there are Christmas riots over alleged "police brutality" to "welfare mothers" in major department stores throughout the nation next month, U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark should order a complete investigation of the conspirators' activities. Perhaps he should begin by inquiring into the activities of the Rev. Lawrence L. Durgin of the Broadway United Church of Christ, a place that plays weekly host to conspirators already responsible for lawlessness that has caused riots, physical injuries and ex-

tensive property damage. Even though our U.S. attorney general is on the way out of office, he still has a sworn duty to perform for the American people.

(NOTE.—Half way through the meeting, my assistant William Good and I were challenged about our presence there. It seemed very dangerous to remain and a few moments thereafter, we left.)

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 4, 1969]

MINISKIRTED PROTESTER: NUN TELLS OF HER DAY IN JAIL

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—Sister Cecilia ate a hearty meal, took a bath, set her hair, put on a miniskirt and talked about jail.

"Bad . . . completely dehumanizing," the 31-year-old Maryknoll nun said yesterday. But the inmates, she said, were "beautiful."

Sister Cecilia walked out of the St. Louis jail at noon yesterday after spending 24 hours behind bars for refusing to pay a \$500 fine assessed for handcuffing herself to the revolving doors of a department store during a "Black Christmas" demonstration.

The white nun said one inmate loaned her a sweater she wore while enduring the conditions at the jail.

"The women there in jail were very beautiful to me," Sister Cecilia said after being freed on a \$1,000 appeal bond. "They couldn't believe I was in jail for the type of charge that was leveled against me."

Sister Cecilia is not the typical nun. A member of the Action Council To Improve Opportunities for Negroes, she took part in the downtown demonstration at the Famous Barr department store Dec. 4 to protest the commercialism of Christmas, which she said causes poor whites and Negroes to go into excessive debt.

She handcuffed herself to two revolving doors and was arrested. Found guilty of disturbing the peace and fined \$500, she said an "act of conscience" forbade her to pay the fine. She went to jail Thursday.

After her release, Sister Cecilia ate a hearty meal at St. Ann's Parish where she is a social worker and teacher, took a bath and set her hair. Dressed in a miniskirt, she held a news conference.

"Although this is my first arrest for civil disobedience, I would certainly do it all over again," Sister Cecilia said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 24, 1968]

WELFARE CLIENTS TO BE TOLD OF RIGHTS

People receiving welfare aid will be formally told for the first time next month that they will no longer have to let investigators into their homes.

The District Welfare Department said it would give recipients and applicants a revised brochure explaining the investigations, in response to a court decision last June.

Antipoverty lawyers here recently lost a legal bid to require the Welfare Department to mail notification to welfare recipients of the U.S. District Court decision that prohibited aid cut-offs when clients refuse to admit Department employees to their homes.

FEAR OF LOSING CHECKS

The lawyers argued that welfare clients still fear they would lose their checks if they shut out the investigators, because the Department had not informed them otherwise. The Welfare Department had spelled out its old policy of terminating aid when entry was refused in an earlier brochure this year.

Deputy Welfare Director Albert P. Russo said the Department simply ran out of the old brochures, which were still in circulation this fall. To prepare new ones, he said, "obviously we have got to reflect the new changes."

The new pamphlet will be mailed to all public assistance recipients and given to applicants at the Department offices, Russo said.

The outside cover will say that the booklet contains revised information.

NEW PAMPHLET

A Public Welfare Advisory Board committee is preparing the new pamphlet and is expected to make its recommendations to Welfare Director Winifred G. Thompson next week. Russo said the new brochure would probably be printed the first week in January.

Neighborhood Legal Services Project attorney Peter Smith met with the subcommittee last week to urge that the new policy be expressed in simple language easily understood by welfare clients.

Russo said the brochure would probably say that the Department will not "discontinue assistance payments" when clients do not admit investigators. A statement that the Department will not "stop or hold up recipients' checks" would have more meaning for welfare clients, Smith said.

REMARKS OF HON. MELVIN LAIRD BEFORE THE HUMAN ECOLOGY SYMPOSIUM, NOVEMBER 26, 1968

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body are properly concerned about the most obvious problems and difficulties confronting the country such as the war in Vietnam, domestic unrest, inflation, and a myriad of other sticky questions too numerous to list here. However, we cannot forget that ticking away like a timebomb is the serious problem of environmental control and if we are honest with ourselves we can come to no other conclusion than that which tells us that our environment is being polluted on a scale that long ago reached alarming proportions.

Last November a group of experts in the field of environmental control met at the human ecology symposium conducted at Airlie House in Virginia. These experts displayed excellent judgment in arranging to have our good friend and colleague, Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, the new Secretary of Defense-designate, speak to their group. In reading his remarks, I am reminded of the incisive mind and the great talent which will be lost to us here in the House of Representatives when MEL LAIRD leaves this body to assume his new duties as Secretary of Defense in the Nixon administration.

I was especially impressed with his suggestion that progress in the field of environmental control might be accelerated if the program were patterned after existing programs which have been successful in other fields such as the partnership for health and the regional medical program. In any event, we can all profit from MEL LAIRD's experience and knowledge and I include a copy of his remarks before the human ecology symposium on November 26, 1968, in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD AT THE MEETING OF THE HUMAN ECOLOGY SYMPOSIUM, NOVEMBER 26, 1968

I am delighted to be a part of this important conference. And I want to congratulate

late Dr. Lee, Dr. Stewart, and Mr. Johnson for calling you distinguished gentlemen and ladies together to help them develop a new focus and orientation in dealing with our complicated environmental problems.

There is probably no more complicated subject facing the problem-solvers of the world than this one. And it is complicated still further because human ecology is so closely related to all the other ills that face man in the last third of the 20th century.

If my appearance before such a distinguished audience of experts is to serve any useful purpose, it will not be found in cataloguing for you what you already know far better than I. Rather, I might serve a better purpose by trying to place in some perspective the nature of the limitations that face us in our quest for a better life for all. Then I might suggest for your consideration the direction in which I feel we must proceed if true progress is to be made in the immediate years ahead.

The first requirement is to be as candid as I can with you. I would like to do this by listing some hard facts. First, yes this nation and indeed large areas of the entire planet are destroying the balance of nature through unwise use of our natural resources, through constant and continuing pollution of our air and water, by overcrowding in our cities and by a host of other abuses that have been spelled out eloquently for you at this conference.

Second, we have definitely reached a time of crucial decision, a time when we must begin to reverse the trend lest we bequeath to our children a heritage of insoluble problems.

Third, there is a war going on in Vietnam that is costing this nation more than 30 billion dollars a year and even if it ends tomorrow, there is little prospect that our massive defense budget will diminish very much.

Fourth, on last June 30th, the United States closed its books on a fiscal year that ended \$25.4 billion in the red. This not unusual imbalance in our fiscal affairs is one direct cause of the economic woes we are enduring in this country today.

Fifth, our new President, like his predecessors, faces a budget situation that is going to force nothing but hard choices in the immediate years ahead. Education demands will be up. Welfare costs will sky rocket. Interest on the national debt will jump. Health needs will multiply. Slum improvement and crime prevention and war costs will continue to compete unmercifully for every federal dollar that exists. And we politicians who must answer to our consciences and our constituents as well as to our knowledge of what is needed must live with the frustration of being unable to provide all of the dollars and all of the programs necessary to deal with these problems.

I could go on but this should be sufficient to paint the picture I want to paint. I have been asked to discuss the role of government in connection with the subject of your deliberations, human ecology. To do this, I felt it necessary to give you, however briefly and incompletely, a taste of my own frustrations and the frustrations that a Dr. Lee and a Mr. Johnson must face on a daily basis.

No matter how grandiose our plans or how clearly we might perceive what needs to be done in a given area of public policy, there always comes that moment of truth when the cold, hard questions of where the money is coming from has to be faced.

I don't want to belabor this point and I don't want to mislead anyone about my own position. It is not my view that we have to bequeath a heritage of insoluble problems to our children. I do not believe our budgetary problems are insurmountable or that we can't improve the quality of education, straighten out the terrible problems in our cities, correct the horrible mess that is our welfare system, improve the unemployment

problem or reverse the terrible trend toward an environment that is unsuitable to man.

On the contrary, I do believe that as a nation, the United States can—indeed it must—make significant forward progress on all these fronts in the immediate years ahead.

The dynamics of the present situation are such that we can either progress or go backward—we can no longer stand still or merely preserve the status quo. All of us want, of course, to move forward and progress.

Why then, did I begin my remarks with the emphasis on budgetary problems? Frankly, because unless we start admitting the fact that our solutions are not going to come exclusively or primarily from the federal purse, we will be doomed to another generation of grand talk and mean performance.

The question that faces us, ladies and gentlemen is, how best can we ensure progress, faced as we are with the impossible demands on our budgetary resources and the incredibly complex nature of our many difficulties?

First, I think, we have to dispel some popular myths. Some seem still to feel that saving the environment or cleaning up the slums or abolishing crime is a matter of money alone, that if only the Federal Government would open the purse strings a bit further, the problems would be solved—and by now all of us should know this is not the case.

Others feel that the only answer is for the Federal Government to set up some sort of "environmental manager"—a super-agency perhaps—which would tell us all what to do about every aspect of environmental use. This is not only an impractical dream it is an unappealing one. It probably originates in the hope that, after turning all these problems over to some "expert," the rest of us could get on with business as usual. The questions are too complex and far-reaching for this. They involve not one agency, but every agency of government, not one level of society, but all levels. They enter into every step in our material progress, and complicate thousands of daily decisions in commerce, construction, agriculture, and every other activity of a busy modern world. Unless we are ready for the Congress and the President and all the rest of government to go home while we turn ourselves over to a "Controller" out of Huxley's "Brave New World," it is wishful thinking to suppose we can so easily rid ourselves of our concern about the environment.

As with most of the serious problems we face in this country, solving the environmental crisis will require a complex, coordinated effort by national, State and local governments, by private organizations, universities, and business.

Our greatest challenge, as we approach the decade of the 1970's is to find mechanisms and to institute arrangements that will bring this coordinated effort about.

We must marshal the dynamic forces that made this nation great and unleash a concerted attack that will lead to cleaner air, less polluted water, improvement of the conditions in our cities, and a better preservation of our natural resources while countering the undesirable side effects of our expanding technology.

If we can do this, we can create for our people, even with tremendous population increases which are foreseen, conditions that will provide the "good life" which has always been our goal.

President-elect Nixon has made clear his own awareness of this problem and his own commitment to finding ways of advancing the partnership approach between the public and the private sectors in order to make maximum use of the knowledge and the resources this great nation already has at hand.

I heartily concur in this viewpoint and in the need, as expressed by the President-elect for developing "objective standards of environmental quality, and effective, fair means of enforcing them. We need to match

advances in technology with advances in government."

Put these two commitments of President-elect Nixon together and we begin to see a pattern for the future that is essential for progress in this area. On the one hand, we must bend our efforts toward defining better than we have so far the basic ingredients of an environment suitable to man. On the other hand, we must seek in the policy arena to institute programs and arrangements that will maximize the efforts at all levels of our society to fight and to reverse present trends.

At this point in our history, confronted on every side by the ugly and unwholesome results of our past mistakes, few could dispute that one of our most urgent needs is to develop objective standards that show what is actually required to maintain an environment suitable to man's needs. This is a problem of definition that requires the assistance of the best scientific minds in our society. I am glad to learn that the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service intends to give priority to this important task.

In fact, the lack of such criteria in several areas of urgent need, is probably a major cause of our failure to move effectively against environmental hazards. In the absence of clear options, there can be no sound decisions.

We are something like the airplane pilot who radioed back to his base, "Am lost in fog. Shall I proceed to destination or return to base?" His commanding officer, being a great advocate of personal initiative, radioed back, "Yes." Confused, the pilot called back, "Do you mean yes I should proceed to destination or yes I should return to base?" This time the answer was, "No."

All of us, including Congress and the Chief Executive, who are faced every day with decisions affecting the environment have found ourselves in somewhat the same position as that pilot in our need for clear guidance from the scientific community. We cannot postpone or avoid decision. We cannot be satisfied with ambiguous answers. And we cannot wait for science to understand everything there is to know about human biology and psychology.

We need to consolidate and clarify what knowledge we already have and act on it. Government at all levels, in concert with its citizens, must, as Mr. Nixon has said, find "effective, fair means" of assuring that our knowledge of human ecology is applied.

Perhaps, in some instances, where environmental problems are clearly of a national scope and not amenable to state or local action, effective remedies may require some form of Federal regulation. But as we seek solutions to the multitude of existing and potential environmental problems which diminish the quality of life today and cast an ominous shadow over the future, we need to take a close look at a variety of approaches.

We already have certain programs on the books that represent varying approaches to this problem.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 is one example. It authorizes the development of Federal criteria and distribution of recommended control techniques. While it establishes Federal responsibility to assure clean air, it seeks to promote meaningful action by State and regional agencies to control pollution. Under this Act the Federal government designates Air Quality Control Regions and approves air quality standards for these regions. In essence, what Congress initiated through this legislation was a program for regional control of air pollution, supported by Federal funds, and based on Federal criteria.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act addresses itself to this area of environmental control in a somewhat similar fashion. Under that legislation, Congress initiated comprehensive river basin planning for pollution control, with Federal financial assistance.

State standards for water quality, to protect their downstream neighbors, are subject to Federal approval. States have primary responsibility for enforcing water standards, but the Federal government under this act may intervene where necessary to prevent interstate water pollution.

Both the Air Quality Act and the Water Pollution Control Act require that Federal research be directed toward development of the information needed to establish standards to protect the public health and welfare and also require the administering agencies to determine the economic feasibility of various control techniques.

Let me add one word here. If the programs we already have on the books are going to work, they will need support. Putting water pollution control under the Interior Department—separating it if you will from health—was a mistake.

All environmental problems, such as air and water pollution, must be considered as part of a single problem. Proliferating the attack by dispersing it all over the federal establishment can only dilute the results. Consolidating them into a single environmental health agency will advance the prospects of greater public and Congressional support.

Another program currently on the books which offers a different approach to national problems is the Regional Medical Program, a fine example of cooperation between the medical profession, the universities, private research institutions, and the Federal government. This program provides continuing education to physicians who have been practicing for five years or more, in an effort to put into practice the latest advances in diagnosis and treatment in the fields of heart disease, cancer and stroke.

It seems to me this approach might be considered as a possible model in the environmental area. The problem is not dissimilar from that confronting the medical profession in its need to assure application of new knowledge. But it is even broader, for it is interdisciplinary. Architects, planners, transportation specialists, doctors, State and local health department officials, city managers,—the entire domestic side of the governmental effort—as well as decision makers in the private sector, need to be instructed and updated on environmental problems and the best methods of avoiding or correcting them.

These programs we have been talking about are in existence. They are operating. And they will meet with varying degrees of success as we move down the road. But by themselves, they will not do the job. More is obviously needed. And more we must have.

In this area as in so many others, we need a breakthrough, a bold new approach that doesn't have to begin "from scratch," that doesn't need a five year gestation period, that when initiated, it will begin to work.

That kind of a program has to spark existing institutions and give new force to present arrangements. I've said we have to consolidate our efforts within the federal establishment itself. But outside of that establishment and, hopefully sparked by it, we need a different emphasis, a decentralized one. We need, in my view, to place primary stress upon a dispersed and decentralized attack outside of Washington. We need this in order to implement a very important principle recently restated by Daniel P. Moynihan, Director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies. Speaking to the National Board meeting of the Americans for Democratic Action, Moynihan argued that the nation cannot be run from agencies in Washington, that "a system has to be developed . . . under which domestic programs go forward regardless of what international crisis is preoccupying Washington at the moment. This in effect means decentralizing the initiative and the resources for such programs."

This is an important principle not only because it will lead to a more rational means of attacking complicated problems across the board but also because it will insulate these efforts more effectively against competing demands for funds at the federal level. For example, the charge can be made that we seem to be more interested in improving man's potential environment on the moon than we are in correcting it here on earth. A comparison of the dollar commitment at the federal level between reaching the moon and restoring clean air on earth would certainly bear this out.

We have to do a better job of ordering our priorities in this federal system of ours.

I firmly believe that this can best be done, in "Pat" Moynihan's words, by "decentralizing the initiative and the resources" for attacking these problems.

What I have in mind, for example, is the institution of a program of tax credits where industry would be given added incentive to curb its own pollution of the air and water. Another program would provide functional grants to states and localities to be used specifically for correcting environmental problems.

These approaches do not necessarily require a smaller involvement or investment by the Federal government than possible alternatives. But they do promise greater effectiveness and can unleash the dynamic forces that have made possible the growth and progress of this nation.

Experience has shown us—and I can speak with particular knowledge of various programs in the fields of health, education, and welfare—that the approach which attempts to solve every problem from the top down, results in very slow progress indeed.

For some years, we were wedded to the idea of aiding and guiding categorical grant programs, tailor-made in Washington to accomplish narrow and specific objectives. Within the Congress, and throughout the Nation, during the last few years, there has been growing disillusionment with the results obtained by this approach. An obvious defect in such plans was that they encouraged the States to emphasize health activities for which the money was available rather than those dictated by their own needs.

Consequently, in 1966, the Congress moved away from the categorical grant system and established block grants to State and regional planning agencies to enable them to attack their health problems according to priorities which they themselves establish. This comprehensive Health Planning program, which is also known as the Partnership for Health, is an important departure from the traditional approach to Federal spending. This program could serve as a model for establishing effective environmental control programs throughout the Nation, with Federal resources providing the base for State and regional action.

As we seek to find the best means of improving man's environment, let's try to do it in a way that will give everybody a piece of the action. Because everybody, after all, has a stake in the outcome.

I cannot believe, in this representative system of ours, that local and state leaders do not realize their own enormous stake, personally and politically, in finding the better answers, in eliminating the smog and wiping out the slums and upgrading educational offerings.

All of us want to incorporate the best principles of human ecology into our agricultural practices, our city renewal programs, transportation and all the rest.

The true test of our national leadership in the coming years will rest in how well we were able to exploit the good intentions of all Americans—government officials and private citizens—in moving toward solution of these problems.

There is one vital point upon which I think we can all agree. That is, we need to know more about *what is happening to man* in our contemporary environment, so that government at all levels, businessmen, planners in every field, can make intelligent decisions regarding environmental change.

Common sense can guide us a part of the way, in some important and urgent areas. We don't need laboratory evidence to convince us that the environment of our city or rural slums is destructive to the human body and spirit. We know that pure food and water are better than contaminated. But there are other aspects of the problem—and components even of those I have mentioned—that are far less clearly understood. In many cases, we must weigh ecological debits against ecological credits in order to come up with a satisfactory balance sheet.

The miracles of chemistry, for example, have helped make possible our abundant food production; plastics and synthetics have brought undoubted benefits. Yet, on the debit side, chemical contamination of the environment presents some frightening threats to human health; the trouble is that, in many instances, we have not even begun to define the nature and magnitude of these various hazards as they collectively affect man.

Obviously, modern man's total health and welfare are dependent upon these products of his scientific and technological ingenuity. We live, and those who come after us will live, in an age of chemistry, of new power sources, of ever changing and improved technology—in an environment which increasingly bears the mark of man. No one supposes that we can, or would even wish to, restore the world to the perfect ecological balance which it must have had on the seventh day of creation.

Our problem as I said before, is to assure that the ecological credits of the environment we are creating outweigh the ecological debits so far as man's total health and welfare are concerned. And to do this, we need to know—far more precisely than we do now—what the real and total effect of these various environmental insults is on the human organism or on other forms of life important to human ecological balance.

If pesticide residues constitute a threat to human health—and there is no doubt that they do—at what point does the hazard outweigh our obvious need for an abundant food supply? How do pesticide chemicals interact with other chemical pollutants to which man is exposed? Can we assume that judicious pesticide use can enable us to retain the unquestioned benefits while minimizing the undesirable side effects?

These are very difficult and complex questions, and, as you know, they may be asked about many other environmental pollutants—about lead, for example, as a contaminant in the air, water, and food. How much are people actually ingesting—and what is its effect on the body?

I certainly am not suggesting that we cannot act to control these hazards until we know everything there is to know about them and their impact on human health. On the contrary, I am arguing that we move immediately on these problems by instituting new arrangements to unleash the dynamic forces in our society for an across the board attack.

But if we are to establish sensible priorities now and in the future, we need at the same time to define our present understanding and to enunciate it as clearly as possible so that we can make intelligent decisions while we continue to seek more knowledge. Certainly this is a responsibility that the Federal Government must share, so that all of us, in both the private and public sectors of society will have a clearer understanding of the real consequences of our actions.

You who are here today, leaders in the diverse fields which bear on these trouble-

some problems, must help us in government move toward a deeper insight into man's relationship with his environment. This is a heavier responsibility than may be readily apparent, for the focus government takes in ecology will effect the health and welfare not only of all our citizens living today—but of millions more yet unborn.

If I may, I would like to close with another story about an airline pilot who was flying a hundred passengers across the country in a heavy storm. It was such a violent storm that all on board were terrified. Finally, the pilot's voice came over the intercom saying "Ladies and Gentlemen, I know you're concerned and I would like to report two things to you—one represents good news and the other bad news."

"I'll give the bad news first—we're lost. 'The good news is that we're making record time.'"

In our understandable haste to make this a better world for many, by all means, let's make "record time." But let's make sure we know where we are going, too.

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS AS VIEWED BY A TOP COLD WAR STRATEGIST

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia strongly confirmed the thesis advanced in the book "The Vulnerable Russians." In sharp contrast to other positions held these past 20 years as concerns the real enemy confronting the United States and the free world, the thesis on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism has been vindicated time and time again. The author of the book, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, recounts this evidence of confirmation, to which the rape of Czechoslovakia contributes as another substantial piece of evidence.

The article-book review written by Dr. Stefan T. Possony, of Stanford University, shows the fundamental importance of this work. Appearing in the summer 1968 issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly under the title "Understanding Russia and the U.S.S.R.," the article by this top cold war strategist sums it up this way:

Those are basic insights which Americans need if our political survival is to be ensured. Once Dobriansky were at long last understood by the American political elite, this long delayed comprehension of the crucial facts of international life would mark a Copernican turn in American foreign policy.

I recommend strongly to the reading of my colleagues this expert review of "The Vulnerable Russians." The book is must reading for all alert Americans, and copies are easily obtainable at the Georgetown University Bookstore, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

The review referred to follows:

UNDERSTANDING RUSSIA AND THE U.S.S.R.*

(By Stefan T. Possony)

There may be some who would criticize this book as "repetitious." The author, al-

though his perspectives change constantly, does indeed repeat the same points over and over again. He is perfectly justified in hammering his theme: American decision-makers and the American public have been unable so far, to grasp the elementary facts which he is trying to elucidate. There is, clearly, a mental block; and a sledgehammer is needed to break it.

The misinformation which bedevils the vast majority of Americans is that the USSR is a "nation-state," and more specifically the state of the Russian nation. In reality, the USSR is the inner ring of a totalitarian and colonialist Russian empire within which there are imprisoned a considerable number of captive nations. The outer ring of this empire is formed by various "people's republics" in Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America; all of those also are held in captivity. The energy and command center of this empire is Russia, but its main resource bases are located in the areas inhabited by captive nations.

The average American, including the majority of our intelligentsia and our political leadership, fails to understand the political and ethnic structure of the USSR. If Americans ever heard of the "other" languages spoken in the USSR, they believe them to be "dialects." It is, unfortunately, quite clear that only few Americans ever thought about the proposition that the captive nations within the USSR are just as much entitled to self-determination as any other nation in the world and that, for example, Ukraine and the Turkic SSR's "belong" to Russia as little as Canada and Mexico belong to the United States.

Dobriansky is right when he says that American misunderstandings about the Russian empire and its various "nationality questions" go back to President Wilson who, he asserts, committed a colossal political blunder "when out of plain ignorance, he failed to apply the principle of national self-determination to the many subjugated non-Russian nations in the Russian empire." A period of 50 years would seem to be time enough to recognize an obviously enormous error and to correct the underlying misinformation. But the American "image" of the USSR remains completely distorted.

Granted that the Free World is confronted by Russian "imperio-colonialism"—but what about communism? According to Dobriansky, "Marxist-Leninist ideology is only one tool among many used by the Russian totalitarianism, when and where it suits their purposes. Its impact in the USSR was lost under Stalin over 30 years ago, though Khrushchev and his twin successors have lip-serviced it on appropriate occasions."

Dobriansky rejects the argument that the real enemy is international communism and that "the term 'totalitarian Russian imperialism' lays the crime of communism on the Russian nation and people, rather than on the Marxian ideology." The author thinks that "Moscow has no quarrel with this argument." Communism, he believes, is a "mythology." By contrast, imperialism and colonialism have "flesh and blood meaning in the world of today," while communism is an abstract concept which few people know or understand. The reality is "Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism." He clinches his argument with this statement: "In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally fictitious ideologies of super-religious Orthodoxy and racist Pan-Slavism. Today it is millenarian communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion." "The major source of trouble and threat to the peace of the world is not Peiping, Havana, Hanoi, Cairo and what have you, but solely and exclusively Moscow."

These points are well taken but the analysis is incomplete. There are in fact several trouble spots, although the power of all communist states is, ultimately, derived

* Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*. New York, Pageant Press, Inc., 1967, 454 pages with index, \$5.95.

from Moscow. Secondly, communism is an ideology and a utopia and, therefore, can be rightly regarded as a "mythology." It is equally true that the systems built up behind the Iron Curtain are not "communist" but totalitarian in their essence. But communism—"Soviet communism," not "Marxism"—is the legitimizing political formula of the USSR and, therefore, one of the ties which is holding the empire together. (A typical American misconception which Dobriansky might have slain while he was laboring is that the majority of Soviet citizens believe in communism: this ideology holds its main attraction for people living outside the dictatorship.)

The body of communist doctrine is, furthermore, the intellectual basis on which the policies of the various communist states are coordinated and from which key policies are derived. Finally, it is the foundation of the "international communist movement." This movement is a system of communist parties and organizations or, if one prefers, of communist "politbureaus," and it is running the double empire and dependent outside political movements. Leaving aside the complex question of "polycentrism," the world-wide party apparatus, in turn, is commanded by the dictatorship in the Kremlin.

There is no question but that the Kremlin leadership group is predominantly Russian in composition, though some of its members are "Russified" non-Russians. Yet the question is whether the Kremlin dictatorship is acting out of a commitment for Russian imperialism and is pursuing a goal of maximum Russian expansion and power? Or do the Kremlinites act as Communists for the purpose of establishing communist world power? Do they reach for that power for the sake of a communist social order? And do they aim at preserving the so-called communist system within the USSR?

It can be argued that the *de facto* imperialism engaged in by the Kremlin is not an integral part of communism and, therefore, must be ascribed to Russian motivations. It can equally be argued that world revolution is a key element of communism and that the Kremlin's imperialism can best be described as the strategy of world revolution. Geopolitically, of course, all Kremlin strategies must be centered on Moscow, Russia (the RSFSR), and the USSR.

I agree that communist ideology has changed fundamentally during Stalin's regime. The so-called "Soviet society" has few of the characteristics that should be displayed by a communist society, except that private ownership in the "means of production" has been abolished. The Soviet system is most accurately described as "fascist in content, and communist in form" is little else but a social and political myth. But it should not be overlooked that in recent years, attempts have been made to rejuvenate the communist ideology and that many policies of the Kremlin, and of virtually all other communist governments, continue to be logically explicable only on the assumption that these men still believe in communism as their main "theology" and follow the communist doctrine as their main guide of action. There are numerous similarities between the white and red Czars but the differences are no less important.

The Kremlin leadership has been using the communist ideology as a tool of power and politics (just as, in varying ways, it has been using nationalism as its tool). But the situation is complicated because these men also think in communist categories and their long range goals, at the very minimum, include the communist objective. Communism, therefore, is more than a mere Kremlin tool. On the other hand, the fact that the Kremlinites, or most of them, are true believers in communism, does not prevent them from using the ideology as a manipulatable tool.

There is the further complication that the Kremlin leaders undoubtedly plan that the communist world empire would be run from Moscow which, of course, leads back to Dobriansky's argument.

These interrelationships are very difficult and elusive and the levels of conviction and purpose must be carefully differentiated. Since the analysis of this complex of motivations and thought patterns has not yet been driven too far, it is at present almost impossible to find descriptive formulas which are correct, complete, simple, and brief.

As a corrective against the multiple mythologies about communism, maximum stress must be placed on totalitarianism and imperialism and, more generally, on the Kremlin's power urge. But I believe Dobriansky is going too far in minimizing the role of communism. Precisely because he himself emphasizes the role of the ideational factor in politics, he should not belittle the function and impact of formula and myth. In fact, he himself often uses the term "Soviet Russia" or Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism," yet he also explains that the term "Soviet" involves a deception—a democratic window-dressing." The author uses "Soviet" in preference to "communist," possibly because he fears a contradiction with his analysis; but this usage discloses that the "communist dimension" simply cannot be neglected. But I agree with him that the term "communist" implies too much theory and involves a loss of realism. To avoid this difficulty, some people occasionally have used the term "Bolshevik," but this expression is too historical. The semantic difficulties of this problem remain immense, even after the problem has been fully analyzed and comprehended.

If my point were integrated with Dobriansky's findings, four factors would be involved: totalitarianism, communism, colonialism, and Russian imperialism. Hence we could coin the expression: "communist totalitarian Russian colonio-imperialism." Stylistically, this formula is awful, but does it have at least the merit of being accurate?

Alas, a further difficulty becomes manifest in Dobriansky's treatment of Russia. He points out, correctly, that "no foreign army or subversive machine had ever overtaken Russia in the imperialist manner" and that, therefore, Russia "properly and technically speaking is not a captive nation." "The Bolshevik revolution and all that followed was thoroughly and completely a Russian phenomenon." Even if I buy most of this sentence, the words "and completely" are wrong. With excellent reason, the author stresses the importance of the many national revolutions which took place in the Russian empire during and after 1917. But non-Russian Bolsheviks were quite strong in some of those revolutionary movements, the Russian Bolshevik party organization was full of non-Russians, and non-Russian popular movements were a vital factor allowing Lenin to seize and hold power. Surely, we cannot forget that the Bolsheviks, in complex relationships which we cannot discuss here, were pushed and supported by foreign strategists. There may be disagreement about the extent of German involvement but the Bolshevik take-over was partly engineered by German imperialism. The Germans did not "capture" Russia and in any event the captor no longer exists, but the captor's instrument has remained. The elections of 1917 showed that Russia did not want the Bolsheviks. Hence, Russia must be regarded as a captive nation *sui generis*, like Germany was a captive of national socialism. China also could be classed in the same category of imperialist powers captured by a conspiratorial power elite.

There is no denying the fact of a perennial Russian imperialism or imperialist

"mood" surviving under communism and indeed this "mood" may be the single most potent source of "Soviet expansion." Lenin himself, and Djilas, have admitted the imperialist character of *sovetskaya vlast*. But if we look toward the future, we should not assume that all Russians and all Russian policies necessarily are imperialistic. Rather we should assume that there are strong elements within the Russian nation who oppose imperialism and who are most anxious to establish a proper *modus vivendi* with neighboring and distant nations. Such a *modus vivendi*, of course, must be applied specifically to the relations between Russians and the nations presently held captive within the USSR, notably Ukraine. After all, since the Communists themselves put Article 17 into the Soviet constitution, why shouldn't we insist that it be taken seriously?

Moreover, we must work from the proposition that the Russians are held captive by the Kremlin dictatorship in the sense that they are denied the freedoms which are their right, as they are the right of every nation. There is no reason to minimize the historical and psychological traditions which never yet have allowed liberty to blossom in Russia. But the stimulation of a reasonable system in Russia surely is one of our major objectives. It could be argued that it is impossible to pursue simultaneously the freedom of the captive nations and of the Russian nation. In this case, obviously, we would have to make a choice. But this demonstration has not yet been made, and I doubt that the case would be convincing, unless there are compelling reasons to believe the Russian elite and the majority of the Russian people want to adhere to imperialism. There is no evidence one way or the other. The assumption of perennial imperialism is plausible but not highly probable. Until we have firm knowledge, I prefer to operate on the assumption that Russia is a captive nation requiring and deserving liberation.

Dobriansky places his strategic thinking on a fundamental syllogism which says: "We are in a persistent cold war with a Messianic enemy, the Soviet version of traditional Russian imperio-colonialism." This situation "poses the inescapable issue of victory or defeat." Hence, the United States must seek to defeat the enemy.

This stark truth has been obfuscated "by a rapid succession of slogans" and an unending "verbal parade" of arguments for "flexibility" and "non-predetermination." Once all these expressions, which have been disorged by the "semantic mill," are analyzed, they are "essentially reducible to . . . containment and liberation." Dobriansky adds that any liberation policy must necessarily be "founded on containment." Yet containment is by itself incapable of holding the enemy; it needs "re-enforcement through liberation." I entirely agree.

American strategy has not faced up to this reality but is hampered by five major weaknesses. *First*, we allow the enemy "adequacy of arms" and have assured the USSR security even in those periods when we possessed overwhelming superiority. *Second*, the United States and the Free World have been progressively accommodating themselves, mentally and materially, to the expansion of Soviet totalitarianism. More specifically, we have done nothing "to disturb the consolidating processes within the vast Soviet Russian empire." *Third*, we have accepted the peaceful coexistence slogan and are doing very little against the imperio-colonialist international conspiracy "under the guise of communism and the communist parties' network." But "multi-billions of rubles haven't been spent for fun to train professional revolutionaries in the hundreds of thousands." *Fourth*, we do not match "the highly concentrated psycho-political propaganda waged by Moscow," nor do we effectively oppose their various political and peace offensives.

The fifth factor "is the real advantage of the first shot which we also guaranteed to Moscow. . . This possibility of a nuclear Pearl Harbor for America cannot be ruled out in the event of a major technologic breakthrough." As a result of its political practices since 1917, but especially since World War II, the United States, "through ignorance and inadvertent errors, . . . has become the historic guardian of the Russian empire."

Dobriansky suggests we use "propaganda" as the "major clue for beating the Russians in the Cold War." His definition of propaganda includes ideas, concepts, doctrines, and systems of thoughts which "ultimately determine and shape the behavior and actions of men." Within this approach "one of the most strategic concepts in our psychopolitical warfare against imperialist Moscow is the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR." We must re-orient our thinking toward the USSR and recognize the strategic significance of the non-Russian nations. We should place emphasis on Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, expose communist-Russian colonialism, and work for "the development of a universalized Declaration of Independence."

Dobriansky does not think we need to worry about specific methods of implementing those concepts: "The devices are endless." The main task is, first, to understand the problem; second, to adopt firm principles and fixed goals; third, to gain a complete and essential knowledge of the enemy, notably the USSR and its vulnerabilities; and fourth, to clarify and revitalize such concepts as national self-determination, national independence, religious freedom, personal liberty under just law, individual freedom of speech, economic investment, association, and representation. Again, I entirely agree.

If we genuinely support those principles, we would in effect be strengthening the captive nations and help them advance on the road of progress.

"The steady dissemination of these truths is a *sine qua non* for the success of the liberation policy and for our victory in the Cold War. After all, the USSR is the heart of the Red octopus; our sporadic absorptions with its tentacles in Asia, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere would not in themselves bring us substantially closer to victory. In fact, it is central to Russian strategy to have us spread ourselves thin and on the fringes, while powerful nationalist trends within Russia's inner empire go virtually unnoticed in the public forum and certainly unexploited by our government."

In essence, Dobriansky's message is that if we ever want to succeed, peripheral conflicts, though they may be unavoidable, are not the answer: the task is dissolve the empire and replace it by free and independent actions. Dobriansky clarified the true meaning of liberation which is not that of a military or nuclear crusade but that of an intellectual confrontation—remember that even according to the Communists, "co-existence" does not extend to the "ideological sphere."

No one knows whether war can be avoided and no one can predict how long it will take, even in the absence of war, before a worldwide clarification of the basic principle of national independence will result in real national independence, regional cooperation, and "a genuine United Nations of Free Nations." Such a change would mean "the end of all imperio-colonialist systems and, with this, probably the end of any major threat to world peace. Certainly the freedom and security of the United States would be guaranteed for the long future."

Those are basic insights which Americans need if our political survival is to be ensured. Once Dobriansky were at long last understood by the American political elite, this long delayed comprehension of the crucial

facts of international life would mark a Copernican turn in American foreign policy.

I want to express my thanks to Lev Dobriansky for a stimulating book which I hope will be read widely and, above all, will be studied thoroughly.

COL. FRANK BORMAN, GARY, IND.,
PIONEER ASTRONAUT

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our Congress must be commended for setting aside Thursday, January 9, 1969, to commemorate the world shaking, moon visit performance of astronauts Col. Frank Borman, Capt. James Lovell, and Lt. Col. William A. Anders. These three great space heroes will be recorded in history for future centuries as the original trailblazers in exploring the mysteries of moon and planet space. They built the foundation for future progress in acquainting humanity with factual information on planets heretofore existing only in the imagination of astronomers, scientists, and all people of our present civilization.

Colonel Borman is a native of Gary, Ind., and the citizens of the great Calumet industrial region are indeed proud that the leader of this first breakthrough in space was a Hoosier and a product of Indiana's First Congressional District.

I am incorporating in my remarks an editorial written by Leigh S. Plummer, publisher of the Gary, Ind., Herald, one of our leading newspapers of the Indiana Calumet region:

THINKING IT OVER

(By Leigh S. Plummer)

Hard must be the heart of any man, watching the blast off at 6:51 a.m. Saturday of Apollo 8, who didn't have a lump in his throat and a tear in his eye.

For riding the craft on man's first journey to the vicinity of the moon were three young astronauts—Frank Borman, James A. Lovell, Jr., and William A. Anders—who were taking risks undoubtedly greater than any ever taken before on any voyage of discovery be it by sea or air.

And then, three hours later, with all apparently going well, came the decision to restart Apollo 8's upper stage for a five minute 11 second burn to kick the space ship into its long looping trajectory that would bring it within 69 miles of the moon early Tuesday morning.

That decision was the one that really marked the difference between this space flight and many that have gone before. And, by the same token, that decision increased enormously the risks for the men riding the craft.

True, every bit of knowledge gained by man since the beginning of history in a multitude of scientific fields had been brought to bear in an effort to make this, the greatest of all voyages of discovery, a safe one.

Physics, chemistry, metallurgy, electronics, navigation, and above all mathematics had each contributed its bit to this flight. But with hundreds of thousands of parts going together to make up the space craft and the rockets which put it on its way, the possibility of a failure of one tiny component is so great as to frighten one.

The astronauts, too, represent in a real sense the finest achievements of the human race in producing stable, intelligent, highly trained men of great ability and courage.

Men who could gear themselves up to a task such as theirs are indeed rare. Even knowing as much as they do about the construction of their craft and the built in safety devices designed to bring them back to splash down in the Pacific in a week, the ability to force oneself to take the risks involved represents a strength of will given to few of us.

Measured as a mechanical achievement, the flight to the moon contrasts sharply with our way of life 75 or 80 years ago when man moved about the earth's surface on foot, on horseback, or on steamed powered trains or boats.

In these few years more has been achieved than in all recorded history before.

And by the same token, this achievement points the way in the next 75 or 100 years to accomplishments which even the most inventive science fiction writers cannot imagine.

Considering that nuclear energy has not yet been harnessed to power space craft, the possibility exists that by the time our grandchildren become grandfathers and grandmothers it will be common for man to travel in space not only to the moon but to the planets.

What's it all worth? Why do it? What has been accomplished? Cynics will say nothing. It is all a waste of money and lives. But others will take a more charitable view—the flight of Apollo 8, of Borman and Lovell and Anders—really is just one more step in man's quest for knowledge, in his never ending effort to attain the unattainable.

Striving for goals such as the one the whole world is watching this week is what separates man from animals, from thinking beings from soulless clods.

May the three—Borman and Lovell and Anders—return safely but if they do not there will be others coming in the future to try again—for that is the way man is built.

UNITED STATES-COMMUNIST TRADE REPORT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the export control report submitted by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce for the third quarter of 1968 contains interesting data on U.S. trade with Communist countries.

Chapter 2 at page 4 reports:

II. SECURITY EXPORT CONTROLS

On August 20, 1968, Czechoslovakia was invaded and thereafter occupied by the armed forces of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, East Germany, Hungary, and Poland. Following the invasion, the U.S. Government instituted a review of all aspects of U.S. relations with the U.S.S.R. and the other invading countries. With respect to U.S. commercial and economic relations with these countries, it was concluded that the national interest of the United States would not be served by severing trade relations with them, and that the policy of permitting non-strategic trade and related business contacts should be maintained.

Accordingly, the Department of Commerce has continued to process export license applications for these Eastern European destinations with care, to screen out commodities and technical data the use of which might adversely affect the national security of the United States. To this end, proposed

transactions for which export licenses were sought for these countries have been considered on their individual merits, and licensed or denied according to their implications for U.S. national security and welfare. In assessing these implications, the Department of Commerce, in consultation with the Departments of State and Defense as well as other U.S. Government agencies, has continued to take into account prevailing security and foreign policy considerations, as well as the government's long-range trade policy.

U.S. businessmen who have inquired about export transactions to these countries have been informed that the concern and uncertainty introduced by the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia should not be ignored in making business plans concerning transactions with these countries.

And at page 20:

Export Licensing to Eastern Europe
Commodity Applications Approved

Licence applications for commodities valued at \$36.8 million were approved for export to Eastern Europe during the third quarter 1968. Principal destinations were the U.S.S.R., \$15.2 million, and East Germany, \$9.3 million. This third quarter total compares with \$44.1 million approved in the previous quarter and \$23.1 million approved in the third quarter 1967.

Industrial machinery accounted for \$15 million of the total value approved, principally to the U.S.S.R., \$11.3 million, and Rumania, \$1.5 million. The passenger automobile plant being built by FIAT in the U.S.S.R. was the destination for \$10.8 million of these goods, including automatic piston machines, \$5.1 million, automatic crankshaft grinders, \$2.3 million, and industrial furnaces, \$1.3 million.

Agricultural commodities valued at \$12.3 million were licensed for export, primarily to East Germany, \$7.4 million; Hungary, \$2.7 million; and Czechoslovakia, \$1.5 million. These commodities were corn, \$8.5 million; yellow grain sorghums, \$2.3 million; and flax, \$1.5 million. Chemicals worth \$5.3 million were approved for export to Eastern Europe. The U.S.S.R. was the destination for \$3.3 million of these, including aluminum oxide worth \$1.4 million.

Cold-rolled carbon steel sheets valued at \$1.4 million were approved for export to Rumania. Other approvals for Eastern Europe included electronic computers, peripherals, and statistical machines, totaling \$1.7 million; and scientific and electronic instruments and equipment, totaling \$1.2 million.

Temporary Exports

In addition to the above, the Department approved applications for the temporary export of commodities valued at \$1.8 million for purposes of exhibition, demonstration, or testing in Eastern European countries. The principal destinations were Czechoslovakia, \$886,948, and the U.S.S.R., \$784,794.

At the conclusion of the exhibition, demonstration, or test in Eastern Europe, these commodities must be returned to the United States or other country from which they were shipped, unless prior written authorization for their disposition has been obtained from the Department.

But at page 29 as to prohibitions on trade with Rhodesia and South Africa:

Special licensing policies

The Department continued a number of special export controls undertaken to further U.S. foreign policy and aid the United States in fulfilling its international responsibilities. These included general prohibitions on exports to the Republic of South Africa or the Middle East of commodities likely to be used for military purposes, and on commodities and technical data exported for use in the development or testing of nu-

clear weapons, explosive devices, or maritime propulsion projects. (See the 83d Quarterly Report for a discussion of these policies.)

Licensing policy toward Southern Rhodesia

As reported in the 84th Quarterly Report, on July 16, 1968, the Department imposed a virtually total embargo on exports to Southern Rhodesia. This was in accordance with U.S. policy supporting United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 253 of May 29, 1968, in which unanimous agreement was given to near total sanctions against trade and other transactions with Southern Rhodesia. The Department's action was taken pursuant to authority in the Export Control Act which directs the use of export controls to further U.S. foreign policy.¹

General license exports to Southern Rhodesia are now limited to such published media as books, newspapers, maps, calendars, and developed documentary motion picture film. Validated license exports are restricted primarily to foodstuffs required in special humanitarian circumstances and commodities strictly for medical or educational end uses. (See *Current Export Bulletin* No. 968).

On July 29, 1968, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, the President issued Executive Order No. 11419. With certain exceptions, this order prohibits U.S. nationals from engaging in commercial and financial activities that would support the economy of Southern Rhodesia. In addition to exports, prohibited activities include the import into the United States of Rhodesian-origin goods, financial transactions, and carriage on U.S. vessels and aircraft of exports and imports involving Southern Rhodesia. On September 10, 1968, the Department of Transportation announced aviation sanctions implementing this executive order. Comparable shipping control regulations were in preparation by the Maritime Administration at the time of this writing.

And at page 27, trade with Cuba—exclusive of foreign aid granted in the way of ransom to recover hijacked airliners:

Export licensing to Cuba

The Department approved exports to Cuba worth \$12,533 during the third quarter 1968. These exports consisted of insecticide sprayers, worth \$11,960, for the Pan American Sanitary Bureau's yellow fever program; clothing, personal effects, drugs, and medicals, valued at \$523, for American citizens detained in Cuba; and \$50 worth of parts for a teletype printing machine used in connection with refugee flights from Cuba.

ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 3, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1968, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, chairman of the board of the New York Times, whose reputation as a journalist extended throughout the world, died in New York City. Since the Congress was not then in session, I want to pay tribute now to Mr. Sulzberger and to the sense of journalistic integrity which he brought to the newspaper world.

Arthur Hays Sulzberger joined the New York Times in 1918 as assistant to

the general manager. From that time onward he was wholly identified with the paper, its purposes, and its policies.

Following the death of his father-in-law, Adolph S. Ochs, in 1935, Mr. Sulzberger became publisher and president of the Times. As a journalist, he participated not only in conventional fields of newspaper administration but also in several pioneer endeavors, including the first transmission of photographs by wire, which revolutionized the use of photos in the newspaper industry. One of his great accomplishments as publisher was to repeatedly recognize the value of technical innovations at an early stage in their development and to incorporate them into New York Times technical processes. As a result, the paper was always able to keep pace with the numerous technical improvements that marked the development of journalism in the 20th century.

When Mr. Sulzberger assumed control of the paper, the Times was faced by stiff competition from several other morning newspapers. Under his leadership, New York Times circulation grew from an average daily total of 465,000 copies in 1935 to 656,000 in 1960. Last month, its circulation reached 1,025,873. The circulation of the Sunday Times rose from 713,000 in 1935 to 1,331,871 in 1960. It, too, has continued to rise, reaching 1,579,000 last month.

Although he never forced his views upon the New York Times editorial board, Mr. Sulzberger was always a figure of considerable influence. In advance of U.S. entrance into World War II, when isolationist sentiment was strong, he recognized the true nature of the Nazi threat and was instrumental in urging assistance for Britain. During the war, Mr. Sulzberger made several trips to distant battlefronts and capitals in both Europe and Asia. Toward the end of the war, the Times, at his urging, championed congressional proposals for establishing vocational rehabilitation programs for veterans wounded in action.

During the period when the excesses of Senator Joseph McCarthy became most flagrant, the Times, under his leadership, led the opposition to McCarthy's wild attacks on civil liberties.

In 1957 Mr. Sulzberger stepped down as president of the New York Times and in 1961 he retired as publisher, although he retained his post as chairman of the board.

In looking back on his career, Mr. Sulzberger could reflect upon the fact that the New York Times had enjoyed enormous success during his tenure as director of the paper. During the period in which he directed the operations of the paper, the Times achieved special distinction as a forthright exponent of creative journalism. Its news coverage and interpretive reporting evolved high standards of purpose and achievement, and many of its reporters earned independent fame. At the time of Mr. Sulzberger's retirement from active supervision of the affairs of the paper, the Times was financially strong, progressive technically, and generally regarded as the leading morning daily in the country. It is a record of achievement that future

¹ Sec. 2(1) of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended. (See appendix of this report.)

publishers will be hard pressed to emulate.

In his eulogy to Mr. Sulzberger at the service held in his memory James Reston said:

The test of great leadership is whether it leaves behind a situation which common-sense and hard work can deal with successfully.

Judged by the standards of that test, the continued success of the New York Times is a clear manifestation of the greatness of Arthur Hays Sulzberger's leadership.

Commenting upon the accomplishments of Mr. Sulzberger, the Wall Street Journal observed:

No newspaper can be greater than the vision and integrity of the man who makes the ultimate decisions. . . . With his passing, Arthur Hays Sulzberger leaves both a priceless gift and a worthy challenge to those who come after.

In the estimation of the Washington Post:

Mr. Sulzberger played a leading role in the development of interpretive reporting and caused the Times to speak out more clearly and strongly on the issues before the United States and the world.

Editor F. M. Flynn of the New York Daily News said:

Arthur Hays Sulzberger, by his intelligent and kindly approach, won the affection of his great organization and earned a position of top rank in the world of journalism. His character was indelibly imprinted on the pages of the New York Times during his stewardship. His place in the history of journalism is high and secure.

J. R. Wiggins, U.S. Representative at the United Nations, and former editor of the Washington Post, observed:

Such were the integrity and the talents of Mr. Sulzberger that as a journalist he would have made any newspaper great. It was his achievement to have made a great newspaper greater.

Paul Miller, president of the Associated Press, has said:

Perhaps better than any other group outside his family and the New York Times, we (of the Associated Press) have been in a position to recognize his greatness.

Vice President HUMPHREY said of Mr. Sulzberger:

His leadership helped develop the Times into one of America's great newspapers, and his death diminishes us all.

Speaking both from the heart and from the vantage point of long and close association, the New York Times obituary writer perhaps summed up the accomplishments of the man best. He said of Mr. Sulzberger:

He was by nature a liberal in the best sense of the word, and he guided, encouraged, and strengthened the Times in a liberal direction without at any time being guilty of the domineering traits that characterize so many of the more flamboyant and less effective publishers of his previous generations. . . . This was a man of deep conscience, steady purpose, and a passion for fair play. It is hard to say good-by to such a man.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert several tributes to Arthur Hays Sulzberger. I include two articles from the New York Times of December 12, 1968; the New York Times editorial of

December 12, 1968; "An Appreciation: Arthur Hays Sulzberger," by Charles Merz, editor emeritus of the New York Times; and the text of the tribute delivered by James Reston, executive editor of the New York Times, at a memorial service for Mr. Sulzberger.

I also include editorials from the Washington Post of December 12, 1968, and the Wall Street Journal of December 16, 1968.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 12, 1968]
ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER, TIMES CHAIRMAN, 77, DIES

Arthur Hays Sulzberger, chairman of the board of The New York Times, died peacefully in his sleep at his home, 1115 Fifth Avenue, at 2:25 P.M. yesterday after a long illness. He was 77 years old.

Mr. Sulzberger had been publisher of The Times from 1935, following the death of his father-in-law, Adolph S. Ochs, until 1961, a period in which he led the newspaper to a growth that saw daily circulation rise 40 per cent and Sunday circulation nearly double.

Vice President Humphrey declared "his death diminishes us all." Governor Rockefeller said he had been "a champion of truth and objectivity." Mayor Lindsay called him "a tower of integrity in the world of journalism."

A memorial service is to be held Sunday at 4 P.M. at Temple Emanu-El. The body is to be cremated. The family requested that instead of flowers, friends send donations to the New York Times Neediest Cases Fund, an annual charitable appeal.

Dr. Nathan A. Perilman, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, is to officiate at the memorial service.

Mr. Sulzberger marked his 50th anniversary on the staff of The New York Times last Saturday. The 30-Year Club, made up of 800 members who have worked at least 30 years for The Times, had planned to present a gold watch to him this week.

However, Mr. Sulzberger's health had been falling since a stroke he suffered in Rangoon, Burma, during a world trip in 1957, and a later stroke. He last came to his office at 229 West 43d Street on Aug. 6.

With him when he died was his wife, the former Iphigene B. Ochs. Also surviving are four children, Mrs. Andrew Heiskell of New York, the former Marian Sulzberger Dryfoos; Mrs. Ruth Sulzberger Golden of Chattanooga, Tenn.; Mrs. Richard N. Cohe, of Stamford, Conn.; the former Judith Sulzberger, and Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, present president and publisher of The Times, as well as 13 grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

THRIVED ON COMPETITION

Faced with intense competition from a variety of other morning newspapers in the period that Arthur Hays Sulzberger was publisher, The New York Times grew from an average Monday-through-Friday circulation of 465,078 copies in 1935 to 656,546 in 1960. With only The New York News now left in the English-language morning field here, The Times's circulation reached 1,025,873 as of last month.

The circulation of the Sunday issue rose from 713,259 in 1935 to 1,331,871 in 1960, and has kept rising, to 1,579,994 as of last month.

Mr. Sulzberger was one of three trustees of the Ochs trust, which holds the controlling interest in the ownership of The New York Times and The Chattanooga Times on behalf of the four Sulzberger children. The two other trustees are his wife and his son.

Mr. Sulzberger had turned over the presidency of The New York Times to his son-in-law Orvil E. Dryfoos in 1957, when he himself became board chairman. Mr. Dryfoos became publisher in 1961. When Mr. Dryfoos died in 1963, Mr. Sulzberger's son took the

post of publisher, continuing the tradition of Ochs family leadership and policies.

NEW YORKER BY BIRTH

A New Yorker by birth, Mr. Sulzberger was educated at Public School 166, DeWitt Clinton and Horace Mann High Schools and Columbia College. During World War I, he enlisted and attended the Plattsburgh training camp, becoming a first lieutenant assigned to field artillery.

He married the daughter of Mr. Ochs, the publisher of The Times, on Nov. 17, 1917, and entered the newspaper profession with The Times after the end of the war.

He was at first assistant to the general manager. From then on he entered into not only the conventional fields of newspaper operation but pioneered in developing transmission of photographs by wire.

Aside from his newspaper efforts, Mr. Sulzberger directed The Times's acquisition of radio station WQXR and was active in the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company, Ltd., a newspaper concern in which The Times has a 42 per cent interest.

Mr. Sulzberger had suffered a heart attack in 1932, leading to cardiovascular problems, but achieved a full recovery.

Despite the strokes in his later years, he maintained an active interest in the news-gathering and other affairs of The Times. Although forced to use a wheelchair, he arrived at the office two or three days a week with two pet dogs cradled in his lap.

In the summers in the last dozen years, he often occupied an apartment in the Times Building rather than always returning to a summer home in Long Ridge, Conn.

A lifelong member of Temple Emanu-El, the largest Jewish house of worship in the world, Mr. Sulzberger had been a trustee of the 123-year-old Reform congregation from Oct. 13, 1935, until he resigned May 10, 1955.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 12, 1968]
SULZBERGER STRESSED NEWS COVERAGE, FINANCIAL STRENGTH AND TECHNICAL PROGRESS—PUBLISHER MADE STRIKING CHANGES—WORKING GRADUALLY, HE GAVE IMPETUS TO REPORTING AND TYPOGRAPHICAL ADVANCES

Arthur Hays Sulzberger, fourth publisher of The New York Times, guided the newspaper from the depression years, through a great war and into an era of prosperity, world tension and scientific revolution. His leadership kept The Times abreast of the 20th century—in news coverage, in financial strength and in technology.

At the same time, Mr. Sulzberger preserved the traditions of completeness and responsibility that had been established by his predecessor, Adolph S. Ochs.

The New York Times came under Mr. Sulzberger's direction upon the death of Mr. Ochs, his father-in-law, in 1935. Although the new publisher did not want to make too many changes too fast, he was determined that the paper should not become an ivory tower.

Consequently, the Sulzberger years, from 1935 until he retired as published on April 25, 1961, were marked by striking changes gradually introduced.

The Times, under his direction, printed far more news on specialized subjects such as science than The Times of 1935 and gave much more space to interpreting and analyzing events.

CONCISENESS A GOAL

The news was written more concisely and in brighter fashion. More pictures, more background information and more personality sketches were introduced, along with a more eye-catching layout and more varied typography. The Sunday edition grew in size and depth.

Sunday circulation nearly doubled in 25 years and daily circulation rose 40 per cent.

The Times staff, the largest of any newspaper in the world, grew to 5,750, including 900 in the news and editorial departments. It included the largest Washington news bureau and the largest foreign staff of any single newspaper.

Other aspects of The Times development reflected Mr. Sulzberger's particular interest in technical progress: Times Facsimile, a pioneer effort in transmitting photographs by wire and the acquisition of radio station WQXR.

Continued expansion—more people, more machines, more circulation—meant that by the nineteen-sixties The Times was outgrowing the fifth site it had occupied since it was founded in 1851.

"BEST SERVED BY YOUTH"

In 1959, the publisher, who had constantly worked to keep production capacity ahead of growth, saw the first section of a supplemental plant go into service at 101 West End Avenue. That plant was one of his last great contributions to the future of The New York Times, which, in his words, had "ceased to be merely a newspaper" and had taken on "the atmosphere of an institution."

Typically, when he voluntarily retired as publisher in favor of his son-in-law Orvil E. Dryfoos, he said it was because The Times must never grow old and "youth is best served by youth." He was then approaching 70.

When Mr. Dryfoos died in the spring of 1963 after a 114-day strike that caused a New York newspaper blackout, Mr. Sulzberger, as chairman of the board, announced that The Times was continuing a tradition of 65 years and that another member of the Ochs family would be publisher. Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, the only son of Arthur Hays and Iphigene Ochs Sulzberger, was appointed on June 20, 1963. Arthur Hays Sulzberger retained to his death the post of chairman of the board.

BORN IN MANHATTAN

Arthur Hays Sulzberger was born in a red brick house opposite Mount Morris Park in Manhattan on Sept. 12, 1891. He was the fourth of five children of Cyrus L. Sulzberger and Rachel Peixotto Hays Sulzberger.

The family was well-to-do and socially prominent. The father was president and later chairman of the board of N. Erlanger, Blumgart & Co., importers and manufacturers of textiles. The mother was a descendant of a family that had left Spain in the 15th century and had come to America in 1702 and had taken part in British colonial life and the American Revolution.

Leo, the Sulzbergers' eldest child, who had gone into the textiles business, died in 1926. Anna and Cyrus died in childhood. David, the youngest, became a New York stockbroker. He died on Sept. 2, 1962.

Young Arthur was graduated from Public School 166, on 89th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues. His teachers were inclined to pamper him, but only once did he achieve an unbroken row of A's. That was when he played Cupid for two teachers, carrying their notes to each other.

He entered Columbia College in 1909 with the idea of trying sanitary engineering as a career. His father explained to friends that a sanitary engineer was the man who held the candle while the plumber fixed the leak.

At Columbia young Sulzberger made the swimming team and performed as a "chorus girl" in the college show. He was not outstanding in his studies, and did not apply himself to serious study until later, when he went to Army schools.

Soon after the United States entered World War I in 1917 he enlisted and was sent to the First Plattsburgh Training Camp in upstate New York. In August, 1917, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Officers Reserve Corps and was assigned to the field

artillery at Camp Wadsworth, Spartanburg, S.C. Through another second lieutenant, Julius Ochs Adler, Adolph S. Ochs' nephew, he renewed a college friendship with Iphigene Ochs, The New York Times publisher's only child.

Mr. Ochs had hoped his daughter would marry a newspaperman. When she told him she intended to marry Lieutenant Sulzberger, he was not pleased. The suitor was clean-cut, alert and handsome, but he was not of the Fourth Estate, and Mr. Ochs was anxious for the future of The Times.

MARRIED IN 1917

However, Mr. Ochs gave his consent. His daughter and Lieutenant Sulzberger were married while the young officer was on leave, on Nov. 17, 1917, in the Ochs house at 308 West 75th Street. The Rev. Dr. Joseph Silverman of Temple Emanu-El officiated. The couple left at once for Camp Wadsworth.

Through the remaining year of the war Lieutenant Sulzberger awaited shipment to France. At the time of the Armistice he was on orders to go overseas, but he never sailed. In later life this disappointment heightened his concern with any encounter he construed as his country's battle.

At the age of 27, Mr. Sulzberger joined The Times as assistant to the general manager. Later he often expressed his modest formula for business success:

"You work very hard, you never watch the clock, you polish up the handle on the big front door. And you marry the boss's daughter."

"That is how I did it."

It was not that easy.

He regretted his "late start" in the newspaper business, and often talked wistfully to writers about their cub reporter days.

WORKED ON FUND APPEAL

He was eager to try his hand in the news field, but Mr. Ochs instead gave him an office and suggested he try anything that came his way. Mr. Sulzberger worked on the annual appeal for charitable agencies—the Hundred Neediest Cases—and various other tasks. Often he wandered through the plant, affable and a little lonely, a minister without portfolio.

His apprenticeship turned out to be more varied and rigorous than that of many other newspaper executives. Mr. Ochs was not an easy taskmaster, and he was determined that his son-in-law learn all aspects of the business under exacting executives.

Mr. Sulzberger's first major job was obtaining an adequate newsprint supply for the newspaper. Travel and study on this job soon made him a newsprint expert. He was notable among publishers in later years for his knowledge of the field.

He made other significant contributions to The Times in his years as an understudy, particularly after 1933, when Mr. Ochs was ill. He played a large role, for instance, in making the paper a leading exponent of the advancement of aviation.

He also directed the development of a portable facsimile transmitter—a suitcase-sized machine that could be hooked into any phone to transmit impulses that could be reconverted into a picture at the other end.

The newspaper industry in the early nineteen-thirties was seeking a practical way to send photographs by wire. Mr. Sulzberger was excited by the possibility that telephone transmission might reduce costs to the level of ordinary telephone toll charges.

One evening he found himself next to Walter Gifford, then president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

"Does it make any difference to you," Mr. Sulzberger asked, "if a telephone user talks English, French or just gibberish?"

"No, indeed," Mr. Gifford replied, somewhat puzzled.

Mr. Sulzberger explained that he was studying a method of breaking down the light values of a photograph into sound values, transmitting them by telephone and then retranslating them into light.

"I don't think it concerns us at all," Mr. Gifford said.

Technicians then devised the portable facsimile apparatus, which was taken to San Francisco for transcontinental tests.

On Feb. 13, 1935, the Navy dirigible Macon exploded off California. Pictures were transmitted to New York. They appeared in The Times the next day, creating a sensation.

Years later, in 1959, the subsidiary that handled the facsimile business was sold by The Times to Litton Industries, Inc.

On April 8, 1935, Mr. Ochs died. For the first time since the 19th century, The Times was to have a new publisher.

Mr. Ochs's will left the newspaper to Mr. and Mrs. Sulzberger's four children—Marian, Ruth, Judith and Arthur Ochs—but named three executors and trustees—Mr. Sulzberger, Mrs. Sulzberger and Julius Ochs Adler, Mr. Ochs's nephew, who was by then vice president and treasurer of the paper.

ADLER TO CHATTANOOGA

The trustees named Mr. Sulzberger to direct The Times. General Adler became publisher of The Chattanooga Times, whose majority ownership was a part of the Ochs estate, in addition holding to the job of general manager of The New York Times.

On assuming control as president and publisher, Mr. Sulzberger gave instructions that for one year there were to be no substantial changes of policy, personnel or contracts.

Thereafter, without haste, he made the substantial changes he foresaw would be necessary.

He defined his role this way:

"The control that the publisher of this paper exercises over its policies is anything but arbitrary. It lies primarily in picking his associates and working with them in harmony—talking things out and, on many occasions, being willing to give way rather than to give orders."

He did not impose his opinion on the editorial board. He did not ask a man to write an editorial counter to the writer's convictions and, in fact, forbade it. He even sometimes had difficulty in getting his own editorials into print.

Sometimes Mr. Sulzberger resorted to expressing his views in a letter to the editor, under one of his pen names, A. Aitchess (A.H.S.). A. Aitchess also appeared as the author of light verse—one of the publisher's favorite diversions. During an illness in his later years he used the pseudonym Harkness P. Vilion, a play on the name of Harkness Pavilion, the section of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center where he lay ill.

A significant part of the inner workings of the paper was the publisher's daily luncheon in the private dining room on the 11th floor of The Times building at 229 West 43d Street.

To these luncheons through the years came hundreds of visitors—kings and queens, presidents and prime ministers, diplomats, scientists, bankers, journalists, leaders and policymakers in every sphere.

The publisher's principal associates attended, and though the luncheons were "off the record"—nothing said at them could be printed—those who guided the paper gained important insights into world events.

During Mr. Sulzberger's incumbency, The Times published the war memoirs of Winston Churchill. The publisher played a prominent part in the \$1-million deal made with Sir Winston by British and American interests. He became a personal friend of the former British Prime Minister and exchanged visits with him. Later, he played a similar role in arranging for the publication of the memoirs of former President Harry S. Truman.

TOOK ON DUTIES

Over the years, the publisher took on responsibility for the fine points of newspaper publishing, rather than casting it off. He delegated authority freely, but nothing in the paper was too small to command his attention.

He was a tireless note-taker. When he saw an error in a headline or a story, or found a question unanswered or a news vendor without The Times, he jotted down the fact in a small black, gold-cornered pad.

He read The Times over breakfast, checking and rechecking. Ideas flowed into his little black book for submission to his associates. If the judgment went against him, he accepted it. But he was not an easy man to talk down. He felt his convictions deeply, loved to argue, was good at debate and dexterous in dealing with people.

"Many people describe themselves as open to conviction," an associate once remarked, "but Mr. Sulzberger actually can be convinced."

Early in Mr. Sulzberger's tenure as publisher, The Times in its editorials advocated opposition to Nazism and Fascism and attacked American isolationism.

A trip abroad in 1938 convinced the publisher that a European war was coming and that it would become an American war. He hoped, though, that the United States might forestall war by throwing its weight on the side of Britain and France against Germany.

He brought about an editorial called "A Way of Life." It occupied the greater part of the editorial page on June 15, 1938, and said in part:

"In any ultimate test of strength between democracy and dictatorship, the goodwill and the moral support—and in the long run more likely than not the physical power of the United States—will be found on the side of those nations defending a way of life which is our way of life and the only way of life which Americans believe to be worth living."

The war started in 1939 and brought German victories. In 1940 France was near collapse. Mr. Sulzberger called the editorial council together and said:

"I cannot live with myself much longer, and I doubt that this country can live with itself much longer; we have got to do something."

Out of the discussion that followed came the suggestion that The Times advocate universal military training. General Adler had long been a supporter of such a system, but Mr. Sulzberger had frowned on it until then. The first of a series of editorials advocating it appeared on June 7, 1940.

MADE VISITS ABROAD

Mr. Sulzberger had always considered travel one of the best ways of keeping himself and The Times up to date. He continued his trips during World War II, visiting distant capitals and the battlefronts of Europe and the Pacific.

During the war, in 1943, he made his second visit to the Soviet Union on a two-fold mission—to inspect Red Cross installations (he was a member of the Red Cross governing board) and to gather background information for The Times.

During World War II the publisher also developed a keen interest in the rehabilitation work of the Army Air Forces, directed by Dr. Howard A. Rusk. He later invited Dr. Rusk to join The Times as associate editor to write on veterans—and later civilians—rehabilitation. This association helped to establish the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of the New York University Medical Center.

The war also presented a conflict between revenue and public service. The publisher's course was firm: with newsprint strictly rationed, he ordered advertising held down (two lines was set as the maximum for classified ads) to allow sufficient space for war news.

Mr. Sulzberger's work on short-wave facsimile transmission helped to persuade him to buy radio station WQXR in 1944. By 1956 WQXR had increased its power to 50,000 watts and had added WQXR-FM. In addition, a network of FM stations broadcast WQXR's programs throughout the Northeast.

The enormous postwar expansion of The Times forced the paper to push its 43d Street building through to 44th Street. Mr. Sulzberger fondly watched every step and scrambled over the scaffolding, endlessly delighted. Guests were invited early for lunch so that they, too, could risk life and limb as the publisher led them through the construction.

In 1951, The Times marked its 100th year. There was a modest celebration, but the publisher's reticence did not stem the tide of scrolls, citations and letters of praise that flowed in. The event was marked by the publication of "The Story of The New York Times," a history of the paper by Meyer Berger, then a noted Times reporter.

Under Mr. Ochs, The Times had described itself politically as "Independent Democratic." In Mr. Sulzberger's time, the word "Democratic" was dropped. In the Sulzberger years the paper supported Republican candidates four times and Democrats three times.

In 1952, The Times broke with the practice of naming its choice only after the parties' nominating conventions. Fearful of the possibility that the Republicans might nominate Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, The Times announced in February that it favored the election of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and promised to support him if the Republicans nominated him.

The paper became the center of a controversy that lasted until Election Day. The controversy became heated and even acrimonious after the Democrats nominated Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois, and campaigns were organized to persuade The Times to switch its support. Thousands of letters and telephone calls poured in.

The publisher explained the paper's position this way:

"We came out for Eisenhower in the pre-convention campaign because we liked and trusted him and because we could not face with equanimity the possibility of Taft's nomination. Not being a Republican organ and, more times than not, not supporting that party's nominees, we felt that we had no right to speak to them unless we said that if the General were the nominee we would support him in the election."

I LIKE STEVENSON

"That is a course that I would unhesitatingly repeat even though I now know that I like Stevenson and despite the fact that I now know that I have found many parts of the Republican campaign distasteful to me."

Neither General Eisenhower's political campaign in 1952 nor his subsequent career in the White House received the publisher's unqualified support.

Mr. Sulzberger's first disappointment with General Eisenhower, and the most serious, came over the problem of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. The Wisconsin Republican's frequent attacks on individuals as "spies" and "traitors" struck the publisher as reckless and irresponsible. By early 1952, he was deeply disturbed by what he considered a basic threat to civil liberties and traditional freedoms and fair play.

The publisher strongly urged General Eisenhower to go on record in the campaign as opposed to McCarthyism and especially to the Senator's attacks on Gen. George C. Marshall, for whom both Mr. Sulzberger and General Eisenhower had the highest regard.

At the candidate's invitation, Mr. Sulzberger drafted a pro-Marshall statement, which General Eisenhower proposed to de-

liver as part of a speech in Milwaukee, in Senator McCarthy's home state.

To Mr. Sulzberger's dismay, General Eisenhower, acting on the advice of Wisconsin Republican leaders, deleted the passage from his address just before delivery. He made the remarks later, in another campaign speech, but the publisher was deeply disturbed by what he regarded as General Eisenhower's failure to stand up under political pressure.

As the issues of domestic Communism and civil liberties became more prominent, the publisher established a firm policy for the newspaper.

"I would not," he declared, "knowingly employ a Communist on the news or editorial staff of The New York Times. On the other hand, I would not institute a witch hunt to determine if one such existed."

The publisher and The Times severely criticized what they considered witch hunts. The paper spoke out against the banning and burning of books, efforts to silence unorthodox thinkers, indiscriminate distrust of Government employees, the distribution of black lists, the passage of restrictive immigration laws and similar manifestations of what it believed was unwarranted fear and hysteria. The Times considered itself to be the special object of an investigation in 1955 and 1956 by a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator James O. Eastland, Democrat of Mississippi. The investigation was presented as a study of Communist infiltration of the press, but Mr. Sulzberger viewed with concern the fact that the majority of the newspapermen summoned to the hearings were present or former employees of The Times.

The publisher cooperated with the committee. He also discharged several men whose conduct during the investigation caused him to lose confidence in their ability to carry out their jobs in the news department.

IN DEFENSE OF FREE PRESS

Early in 1956, however, Mr. Sulzberger felt impelled to go on record in defense of a free press. An editorial said it seemed "quite obvious" that the investigation was aimed at The Times and that the paper had been "singled out" for attack because of the vigor of its opposition to the views of Senator Eastland and some of his associates.

On the question of former Communists on its staff, The Times said: "It will be our policy to judge each case on its own merits. We do not believe in the doctrine of irredeemable sin. We think it is possible to atone through good performance for past errors."

"Our faith is strong," the editorial ended, "that long after Senator Eastland and his present subcommittee are forgotten, long after segregation has lost its final battle in the South, long after all that was known as McCarthyism is a dim, unwelcome memory, long after the last Congressional committee has learned that it cannot tamper successfully with a free press, The New York Times will still be speaking for the men who make it, and only for the men who make it, and speaking without fear or favor the truth as it sees it."

During the difficult Eastland incidents, the paper suffered a blow of a different kind. On Oct. 3, 1955, General Adler died, leaving a personal gap in the publisher's life that could not be filled and a gap in the paper's management that had to be filled. General Adler's successor as a trustee was Mr. Dryfoos, who had married Marian Sulzberger and, in a training pattern similar to that of his father-in-law, had risen to the vice presidency of the newspaper.

RESIGNED 4 YEARS LATER

Mr. Dryfoos was named president of The New York Times Company on April 23, 1957, when Mr. Sulzberger became chairman of the board. It was almost exactly four years later that Mr. Sulzberger stepped down as publisher in favor of Mr. Dryfoos.

His statement at that time, while both sad and witty, again pointed to his concept of himself as a steward:

"No one man can operate a business of this size. He can and must rely upon his associates and in this respect I have been particularly fortunate. It is difficult for me to single out any number of individuals without doing injustice to others. We now are a body over five thousand strong. I do not know which driver it was who overcame the particular difficulties on the night of any one of our great snowstorms last winter or which compositor or proofreader saved us from untold additional libel, or which flyboy caught out the badly printed copy that might otherwise have gone into the White House—or even worse, to me. I bow to the bookkeepers, the telephone girls with their ever-cheerful voices, to the butcher, the baker, and I don't think we make our own candles, but I can assure you that our able mechanical department has plenty on hand against emergencies."

Mr. Sulzberger had succeeded General Adler as publisher of The Chattanooga Times, but served only briefly because he believed newspaper leadership should be "home-grown." In February, 1957, Ben Hale Golden of Chattanooga, who married Ruth Sulzberger in 1946, became president and publisher and Mr. Sulzberger took the new position of chairman of the board of the Chattanooga paper. Mrs. Golden, who filed for a divorce in late 1964, became president and publisher of the Chattanooga paper on Dec. 22, 1964.

In December of 1958, during the involved strike by the newspaper deliverers that resulted in a newspaper blackout in New York, Mr. Sulzberger kept The New York Times news staff at work while all other newspaper plants were dark.

After the strike was over employees who had been kept on the payroll sent Mr. Sulzberger a memorial "to let him know that the men and women who work for him are touched by the great kindness he has shown in the dark period that came this month with forced suspension of publication; that this and past kindnesses, far beyond the margins of moral responsibility, depend their loyalty and shall not be forgotten." There were 330 signatures on the document.

In 1958, the publisher broke with a tradition observed by The Times and most other family-owned newspapers. Because deaths and inheritances had spread the stock of the paper outside the immediate family, he issued the first annual public statement of The Times' finances. It showed that his management had been successful and that he had carried out his precept that editorial excellence and sound business management went hand in hand.

THE 60 PROFITABLE YEARS

The report showed a profit after taxes for 1957 of \$3,010,067. It was the 60th consecutive year that The Times had shown a profit.

Other figures and subsequent reports demonstrated the paper's financial health. During 1958, for the first time, the Times Magazine carried more lines of advertising than any other magazine.

The Monday-to-Friday average circulation of The Times in November stood at 1,025,873. In 1935, it was 465,078. The Sunday circulation had risen to 1,579,994, from 713,259 in 1935.

In keeping with the publisher's goals of service, as well as success, The Times carried on Mr. Ochs's Christmas appeal, the Hundred Neediest Cases. From 1912 through the 1967 appeal, it raised \$18,233,133 for major Roman Catholic, Protestant and Jewish charities.

From his work at The Times, the publisher was precipitated into numberless related duties. Many of these pertained to the paper's radio station and a Canadian newsprint company, the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company, Ltd., in which The Times held a 42 per cent interest.

In 1943, he became the first New York City publisher since the death of Mr. Ochs to be elected a director of The Associated Press. He was re-elected to two more three-year terms.

In matters outside the newspaper business, he sought to concentrate his activities on the cultural and philanthropic life of the city.

PORTRAIT AT COLUMBIA

He was a trustee of Columbia University from 1944 to 1959. Among the many honors accorded to him when he resigned and became trustee emeritus was a portrait commissioned by the university. It was hung in Low Memorial Library, among pictures of other Columbia officials, including General Eisenhower. Mr. Sulzberger had played an important role in bringing the general to the university as its president.

The publisher was also chairman of Columbia's bicentennial celebration.

The university and the Graduate School of Journalism honored him with the Journalism Award for singular journalistic performance in the public interest. The introduction to the citation pointed out a fact that reflected the kind of publisher he was. The paper, the statement read, "has never been known as Sulzberger's Times or anyone else's for that matter."

In all of his public career, in fact, he believed that it was the paper that mattered, not him. One daughter was astonished when she was asked in Europe if her father were the Sulzberger who was publisher of The Times. He had always "stood so consistently behind and not in front of his job I had never realized that Sulzberger was a 'name,'" she wrote later.

In 1950, The Times hailed the publication of the first 50 volumes of the papers of Thomas Jefferson, another project close to the heart of the publisher. The Times had, in fact, given \$200,000 so that Princeton could undertake the huge project. The Times editorial noted with pride that each volume would bear this inscription:

"Dedicated to the memory of Adolph S. Ochs, publisher of The New York Times, 1896-1935, who by the example of a responsible press enlarged and fortified the Jeffersonian concept of a free press."

As The Times was the core of Mr. Sulzberger's public life, his family was the heart and soul of his private life.

By heritage as well as by choice, he was a Reform Jew and he reared his children accordingly. But it was to him a religion, not a nationality. He did not believe Jews to be a race or a people and, like Mr. Ochs, was deeply opposed to the Zionist movement.

He loved children—his own four and their children—and kept the key to children's confidence long after the age when many adults mislay it. He wrote poems for them, made up animal sagas and admonished them from his heart.

He was warm and attracted people easily. Because of the square set of his shoulders and his trim physique, he gave the impression of a tall and dominating man, although he was of average height—5 feet 9 inches. Because he was handsome and carried the newspaper aura with him and because he liked to do things with style, he was characterized often as having glamour.

In fact, one daughter once asked Mrs. Sulzberger if Mr. Sulzberger "were the kind of man who gave bracelets to chorus girls."

In adversity he kept a sense of humor and a sense of proportion. In 1953, when a strike closed The Times, he sat in his office, not brooding but writing a bit of doggerel, a wry comment on the suspension of publication:

"He worked very hard and he never watched the clock
And he polished up the handle of the
big front door.

By dint of hard labor he rose to the top,
And in 35 years The Times was no more."

His humor often took elaborate visual

turns. Many years after his marriage, he contracted to transplant from Lake George, N.Y., the large spruce tree under which the young Iphigene Ochs had once refused him. A truck returned with the wrong spruce, but it was replanted anyway at Hillandale, the family's country home, then in White Plains, and still survives on the property.

HEART OF THE MATTER

The publisher loved games and hobbies. At one point, he and his friend and editor, Charles Merz, created crossword puzzles and finally Double-Crostics for the paper.

It was a rare weekend when the original Hillandale and its successor in Long Ridge, Conn., did not resound to voices—young and old—in games, discussion and laughter.

The publisher, as a bon vivant in town and on weekends in the country, had reduced the old fashioned to the essentials of ice and whisky long before drinks "on the rocks" were common.

A cocktail shaker given to him on one of his anniversaries was inscribed:

Recipe for A. H. S. cocktail:

1 part wisdom, 1 part wit, 1 part humanity, In the fashion of A. H. S., mix well and serve lavishly.

He had trouble remembering names, but his wife could recall them, from the vaguest sort of description. Even with his awkward handicap, he went through many elaborate evenings as the most charming guest or host—courteous, telling brief anecdotes, reciting witty poetry and salting his conversation with broad puns.

His daughter Ruth wrote for a collection she called "A Pophology of Verse":

"A. H. S. is a family man. A fastidious dresser, he is noted for his weekend clothes. He is moody. Amusing. Serious. And endlessly stimulating. He has blue eyes and gray hair. He smokes a pipe and eats pills. He is a dog fancier and breeder, a good judge of bourbon and a country gentleman. He plays cards. He drinks. He works for a newspaper."

In his later years he was beset by ill health. On a round-the-world trip in 1957, he suffered a stroke in Rangoon, Burma, and later had another attack. But he never lost his quick wit.

The theme Mr. Sulzberger inspired for Columbia's bicentennial was "Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof." This might have been his own theme and the theme of his stewardship of The New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 12, 1968]

ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER

For more than a quarter of a century this newspaper drew strength from the foresight, the integrity and the courage of Arthur Hays Sulzberger, first as its publisher and later as chairman of the board. His death yesterday after a long and debilitating illness—fifty years almost to the day since he first joined The Times—has brought sorrow to his associates and a sense of personal and professional loss to free newspapermen everywhere.

It was in a world already threatened by totalitarianism that Arthur Sulzberger in 1935 succeeded Adolph S. Ochs as publisher of The Times. He saw clearly the danger that Hitler and Mussolini and their Japanese counterparts posed to the security of the United States. He also saw clearly the consequent necessity of a wholehearted partnership with those nations which were this country's natural allies in the cause of freedom.

The battle for democracy on the international front was the primary concern of Mr. Sulzberger during the thirties and forties, but it by no means measured the scope of his interest and convictions. He had a lively sympathy with the downtrodden and oppressed of every race, color and creed, and he profoundly desired to see the people of the United States move forward steadily

to new social gains and broader opportunities. He wanted especially to safeguard the fundamental principles of the Bill of Rights, and he was never happier than when he had thrown *The Times* into the thick of the fight at whatever point the liberties of a free people were threatened by an overzealous committee or a reckless demagogue.

He was by nature a liberal in the best sense of the word, and he guided, encouraged and strengthened *The Times* in a liberal direction without at any time being guilty of the domineering traits that characterized so many of the more flamboyant and less effective publishers of his and previous generations. Mr. Sulzberger, urbane and sophisticated as he was, preferred to lead and direct rather than to exercise the mailed fist. Guided by the highest principles of the newspaper profession and armed with complete integrity and firmness of purpose, he proved to be one of the most effective and influential publishers of his era.

Every facet of the many-sided business of publishing a newspaper responsive to the public's need for trustworthy information engaged his attention. He was fortunate in receiving a thorough grounding in the complexities of publishing a large daily newspaper through some fifteen years of service with his father-in-law, Mr. Ochs, architect of the modern New York *Times*; and he carried on the task with vigor and devotion. He was by nature a builder in the literal as well as figurative sense; he took keen delight and direct personal interest in the physical expansion of *The Times* plant as well as in its constantly broadening news coverage of every facet of human existence in every corner of the world. He sought constantly to expand and deepen the range of this newspaper's reporting and interpretation of the news.

Arthur Sulzberger was a faithful friend and joyous companion, a man of high spirit with a ready wit that would break through even his grievous illness of recent years. He was a man who liked to play as well as work, a man with a warm heart and fine zest for life. This was a man of deep conscience, steady purpose and a passion for fair play. It is hard to say good-by to such a man.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 13, 1968]

AN APPRECIATION: ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER
(By Charles Merz)

(NOTE.—Mr. Merz, Editor Emeritus of *The Times*, served as Editor of this newspaper, under Mr. Sulzberger as Publisher, from 1938 to 1961.)

Arthur Sulzberger was a dedicated man. We, who were his friends, know this. We have watched him at his work. We have seen how high he set his standards. We have found, in the seemingly endless pages of the great newspaper whose destiny he long directed, proof of his devotion to what was best and most valid in the traditions of American journalism.

He had inherited from Adolph Ochs a great responsibility. It was his constant effort to meet this responsibility, to improve the fine product which thus came to his hand and to make it a still more useful instrument of knowledge and persuasion in the life of the American people. This was a challenge he could not refuse. This was the opportunity he so eagerly accepted. This was the thrilling adventure to which he devoted more than forty years.

He was a dedicated man. He was also an upright man. His formidable predecessor had set for him the high ideal of reporting the news of an increasingly complex world "impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of any party, sect or interest involved." It was a precept that demanded rigorous honesty. He had no difficulty in following it because he was an instinctively honest man. The thousands of men and women who make *The New York Times* knew this. They knew

that no fear or favoritism, no factor of partisanship, no hint of outside pressure need disturb the even tenor of their work. They knew that what their publisher asked of them was an honest reporting of the day's news and a faithful accounting to their readers.

Arthur Sulzberger became the publisher of *The Times* at one of the critical moments of this century. In Europe a new and evil totalitarianism had just come to power. In Asia the first act of a second world war was already in the making. In the United States the aftermath of a great depression had brought a fresh awakening of conscience and a new conception of the proper relationship between a government and its people.

The new publisher of *The Times* welcomed the opportunity for his newspaper to express its views on these and other great issues of a new day. Under his guidance and with his intimate participation in every editorial decision, *The Times* called for a close union of the democracies to meet the threat of the new totalitarianism. It gave prompt support to the United Nations. It endorsed lend-lease and foreign aid. It urged action by the national government to improve the schools, to build new homes, to befriend the old, the infirm and the unprotected. It played its part in the unremitting effort to achieve a full measure of civil liberties and to win for every American the right to hold his head high, regardless.

The broad range of interests reflected in these editorial opinions found expression also in those activities outside the field of journalism in which a busy publisher found time to play a part. Arthur Sulzberger's interest in education found an outlet in his long service as a trustee of Columbia University. The Rockefeller Foundation profited from his alert interest in its far-flung activities. Of the American National Red Cross he was an incorporator and a member of its central committee. The Congregation of Temple Emanu-El and the directors of the Metropolitan Museum of Art knew him as a trustee and a friend. To these, and to other fine organizations he brought the rich by-products of his experience as a publisher.

He brought more than this. For when we have chronicled, even so briefly, the activities and the interests of the man, there remains the man himself, and the man himself had much to give to any enterprise with which he was associated.

He was a courageous man: over a long period of years he had suffered more than his share of severe and even crippling illnesses, but he never lost either the zest or the habit of hard work.

He was a companionable man: he liked people; he liked travel; he liked the comforts of life, but he did not care much for its extravagance; he liked good food and drink; he liked games, if he did not have to watch other people play them.

He was a strong family man, almost continually surrounded in his out-of-office hours, by children and grandchildren, and happy to be so encompassed; blessed with a lovely and understanding wife, three daughters who were devoted to him and a son to whom he was proud to hand over the reins of authority.

He was an optimistic man: confident, as he demonstrated time and again, that the best days lay ahead; the record shows that some of the boldest steps in the expansion of the facilities of *The Times* and some of its most ambitious commitments were made in an uncertain time.

He was a reasonable man: he did not like his colleagues to agree with him merely because he was in a position of authority; if there was disagreement, he preferred an argument, and if the man who held the opposing view had the better of the argument that man's view prevailed.

He was a purposeful man: it was his firm intention to make his newspaper as accurate,

as complete and as even-handed a record of contemporary history as good faith and hard work would permit, and in the extent to which he succeeded he has profoundly affected the course of American journalism and measurably improved one of the chief means by which people in a democracy can come to grips with the issues of the day.

He was, above all, a man with a profound faith in the democratic process—a man instinctively loyal to the traditions of fair play and instinctively ready to challenge history and sectarianism whenever they threatened the liberties of a free people.

This was Arthur Sulzberger—a dedicated man, an upright man, a loyal friend, a great publisher and a useful citizen.

We say good-by to him with sorrow, but with gratitude for his years among us.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1968]

TEXT OF TRIBUTE BY RESTON AT SULZBERGER SERVICE

(Tribute delivered yesterday by James Reston, executive editor of *The New York Times*, at a memorial service for Arthur Hays Sulzberger)

The purpose of this service of remembrance is to pause for a few minutes to think about the meaning of a life—rather than the moment of a death. We have come here to pay our respects to our dear friend and to his family. And in the process, I hope we may fortify our faith in human decency and renew our courage by trying to recall something of the magic of his personality and the quality of his work and character.

We cannot help but grieve at such a time, but we are not called upon to be morbid. For Arthur Hays Sulzberger was, among many other things, a joyous man. Five years ago, when he was already seriously ill, he wrote out the instructions for this occasion.

There were to be none of the ghoulish trappings of death, he said. No fancy casket, no mountains of flowers smelling of the grave and, on pain of eternal punishment—for some reason not quite clear to me—no Mozart. He had a thing about Mozart and he was forever chasing the poor man off the *Times* radio station.

It is not easy for a man at the top of a newspaper to be joyful these days. Those of us who report have fun: this age may not make sense but it makes news. But a newspaper publisher is a little like a doctor: he spends a good deal of his time listening to people who have a pain. Also, Arthur Sulzberger did not have the good fortune to lead the paper in a calm or joyous time.

BECAME PUBLISHER IN 1935

He became publisher in 1935 during the economic depression and endured the tumult of three wars until the end. This was a time, first, of drift and hallucination, then of unspeakable violence and disorder, leading to the transformation of our professional life, of our national life, and of the larger life of the human family.

Still, he presided over *The Times* during this convulsive period with rare good judgment, unfailing human consideration, and a remarkable combination of seriousness and merriness. Few arguments ever became strident for long at his council table before he broke the tension with an amiable jest.

He had a wonderful compassion for the weaknesses of the human spirit and hated gossip and personal criticism or spite. Nobody ever made a silly fool of himself without being told to forget it. Was anybody sick or in trouble? Arthur Sulzberger was usually the first to help out. Were families separated in the service of the paper? He was usually the first to remember.

He kept a "calendar of kindness" and was forever sending notes or genial rhymes, or presents, to mark birthdays or anniversaries, not only to his own loved ones, but to the larger family of *The Times*, and the widening circle of his friends.

I have known a lot of good newspapermen and a lot of good family men, but not so many who were both. There is an unfailing rule of life—that news always breaks just when a man is supposed to be going home. But Arthur Sulzberger, late home or not, somehow managed to reconcile his professional and family responsibilities.

He was an incorrigible poet, cartoonist, story-teller, amateur painter, interior decorator, drink-mixer and furniture-mover.

For twenty years he moved the furniture up and down and around the old family house at 5 East 80th Street, and then, when he was finally satisfied with the arrangement, he sold the house.

There was an irrepressible streak of Lewis Carroll in him, and he turned his home into a wonderland of his own. Who but A.H.S. would name two of his children Punch and Judy? Who but he could sit on the stairs with the children on his way to a party—demonstrating the art of blowing out his collapsed tall silk opera hat?

He wrote and illustrated books for the children—about Ellie (the elephant) and Allie (the alligator), who turned into pigs when any of the children ate too much ice cream.

His production of illustrated letters to the family was prodigious. He always portrayed himself as Barney Google. He celebrated Aug. 14—the date he first proposed and was rejected—by presenting Iphigene one year with a beautifully iced cake, made entirely of wood.

When she finally did agree to marry him under a tree at Lake George, he had the tree moved to their house in Westchester County. When the eldest of his three daughters was married, he wandered around the wedding reception with a sign on his back, reading: "If you liked the setting and the ceremony, remember I have two more."

SENSE OF PERSPECTIVE

Though he was deeply involved in life, there was something in him that stood apart. His sense of humor was really a sense of perspective, and he used it to a purpose.

His rhymes were kisses, and sometimes they were gentle admonitions to the children, and occasionally they were editorials, but always this exuberant capering was the expression of a merry and a loving heart.

It is only fair to say that he did not pick up this quality on 43d Street—after all, The Times is not widely known as a center of pishy frivolity.

This is something he inherited, and he was obviously a poetic spirit before he was a publisher. He was the second of the three sons of Rachael Peixotto Hays and Cyrus L. Sulzberger.

His eldest brother, Leo, died in 1926. The youngest brother, David, died in 1962. Thus what is passing here is the last member of the seventh generation of a remarkable American family that started here in 1895, before there was an independent country.

From this family too, he inherited not only a merry but a deeply serious strain which increased as his health and strength ebbed.

He was not given to philosophic speculation and wasted little time on phantom ideas. But occasionally he scribbled his thoughts on a little black notebook that was always at hand.

"I have no personal God," he once wrote. "No one who watches over me. No one to whom I am indebted for the gift of life other than my parents, who have been dead for many years."

"My prayers are to me. I challenge myself to be good to those I love, to treat decently those with whom I come in contact. If I deserve punishment, it will be meted out by my fellow men or by my own conscience. That is ever present, and one cannot fool or mislead it."

When we come to assess his contributions to his newspaper and profession, we have to do so without any self-glorification on his part. It may have occurred to a few of you from time to time that modesty is not the newspaperman's most prominent characteristic.

But Arthur Sulzberger was a genuinely modest man. A year after he became publisher, he wrote, "I find myself not as an arbitrary wielder of authority but rather as a servant to the course of events, over which I have no control and to which I must react."

Even after he had been on The Times for forty years, during which he had led it to spectacular successes, he was giving most of the credit to his associates and conceding only that "the backs of my ears are not as wet as they were..."

He was mortally afraid of abusing personal power, or the power of the paper. He was always reminding himself that even in private conversation what he said might carry unintended significance because of the position he held, and either hurt somebody or give one of his reporters the wrong idea that he wanted his views reflected in the paper.

Shortly after Arthur Hays Sulzberger joined The Times—almost 50 years ago—Alfred North Whitehead wrote a little book called "Symbolism" in which he said something which, for me, describes with remarkable precision Arthur Hays Sulzberger's problems and achievements on The Times.

"It is the first step in wisdom," Whitehead wrote, "to recognize that the major advances in civilization are processes which all but wreck the society in which they occur..."

COMPETITIVE BUSINESS

"The art of free society consists, first, in the maintenance of the symbolic code, and secondly, in fearlessness, of revision. . . . Those societies which cannot combine reverence to their symbols with freedom of revision, must ultimately decay from anarchy or from . . . slow atrophy. . . ."

This may help us understand. Newspapering is a savagely competitive business. You have to make major advances or die. The graveyard of great newspapers, alas, is very wide and deep, but Arthur Sulzberger risked the changes and made the advances.

He combined reverence to the symbol and tradition of The Times—and reverence is the right word—with fearlessness of revision. This is no time or place for comparisons, but in most newspapers, the owners tend to consolidate and the managers to innovate.

Maybe because Arthur Sulzberger thought of himself in terms of stewardship rather than of ownership, he managed to strike this difficult balance between the two, and my own experience with him was that he was more fearless in revision than most of us.

What is particularly interesting is how he did it. He didn't have the particular swing or melody of our craft when he joined The Times at 27.

He never even learned how to run a typewriter. He was not a specialist in gathering news or advertising. He was not a prophet of the coming age.

He was not full of self-confidence when he took over and he didn't even begin with the confidence of all his associates, but by any standards of excellence or commerce or ethics, he was a remarkable success.

SIMPLE INTEGRITY

The explanation, I believe, was simple integrity. He combined a general ease and charm in personal relations with good judgment, a belief in young men like Orvil Dryfoos and Arthur Ochs Sulzberger and a true and natural morality of action.

He was not a moralizer, but he preserved that vanishing gift of actually listening to what other people said and then thinking about it before he answered.

The result was that men went away from him feeling that they had been heard out to the end and that they were treated fairly, for he had the gift of reminding us, by his gusto and his example, of the decencies of life.

If you have any doubt about the enduring quality of his example and character, all you have to do is look around.

The new generation of this family is already in place, with another Arthur Sulzberger at its head, and has carried The Times to even greater successes than ever before, and they are going to have to step lively, for the next generation is already knocking at the door.

The test of great leadership is whether it leaves behind a situation which common sense and hard work can deal with successfully.

Reverence for the symbol and fearlessness of revision—all that we have and mean to defend—all that and Iphigene Ochs Sulzberger, and her children, and their children, who will learn the art in their time.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1968]

ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER

By any standard that may be applied, Arthur Hays Sulzberger was a great figure in journalism. It was his good fortune to inherit from his father-in-law, Adolph S. Ochs, the position of publisher of the New York Times at the death of the latter in 1935. The Times was already an eminent journal of wide influence. By patient attention to details and an unflinching interest in the sweep of world events he built it into a greater institution of global dimensions.

One of his primary interests appears to have been to strengthen the reputation of the Times as a "paper of record." But he also played a leading role in the development of interpretative reporting and caused the Times to speak out more clearly and strongly on the issues before the United States and the world.

Though he hated ostentation and worked most effectively in the background, he became a powerful influence in the country for civil rights, freedom and democratic government. A profound believer in the ability of people to make wise decisions, if they are properly informed, he took a most serious view of the obligation of the press to keep the public informed.

Freedom of the press, he believed, was the right of the reader rather than of the publisher. Mr. Sulzberger was well aware of the fact that a great newspaper must be more than the shadow of one man. But in the long years that he presided over the New York Times the influence of his strong personality and his deep convictions about the role of a newspaper in a free land were powerfully in evidence. His death at the age of 77 is a loss not only to journalism but also to the common human struggle for justice, decency and honest appraisal of how the world is wagging.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 16, 1968]

A JOURNALISTIC TRADITION

Around newspaper city rooms and press-rooms it is traditional to underrate the role of publishers in the making of a newspaper. But the truth is that no newspaper can be greater than the vision and integrity of the man who makes the ultimate decisions.

The New York Times owes its tradition first of all to Adolph Ochs. That tradition of excellence, thoroughness and integrity was continued and strengthened by Arthur Hays Sulzberger, so that today the Times is one of the eminent newspapers of the world.

With his passing, Arthur Hays Sulzberger leaves both a priceless gift and a worthy challenge to those who come after.

COMMUNITY CLUBS DAY IN ALBANY

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in support of the fine work done by women's organizations in the city of Albany, and the efforts of radio station WOKO in aiding these efforts, I include in the RECORD at this point a proclamation by the mayor of Albany, the Honorable Erastus Corning, designating January 6, 1969, as Community Clubs Day in Albany. The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF ALBANY

Whereas, the women of the City of Albany are constantly striving through private means to further the cultural, civic and charitable aims of our great City; and

Whereas, the furtherance of these aims requires long and dedicated work, and money to finance worthwhile projects; and

Whereas, Radio Station WOKO has realized this need, and will attempt to aid women's organizations through Community Clubs Awards; and

Whereas, the largest gathering of women's organization executives in Albany's history will meet in the Colonie Center Club Room, January 6, 1969, to commence this endeavor;

Now, therefore, I, Erastus Corning 2nd, Mayor of the City of Albany, New York, in cooperation with Radio Station WOKO, do hereby designate January 6, 1969, as Community Clubs Day in Albany, and call upon all citizens to fully support the civic, cultural and charitable women's organizations in the City of Albany.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Albany to be affixed this 16th day of December, 1968.

ERASTUS CORNING,
Mayor.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF COMMUNISM AND THE NEW LEFT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the autumn, 1968, edition of the Texas Quarterly contained a valuable treatment of the relationship between the new left and communism. Author of this article is Allan C. Brownfeld, an articulate, well-versed observer of both the radical movement and the scope of Communist activities and aims. In addition to this treatment, Mr. Brownfeld is the author of a report entitled, "The New Left"—246 pages—printed as a memorandum prepared for the Senate Judiciary Committee at the request of Senator Dodd.

I recommend both efforts to anyone interested in understanding the new left and especially their interactions with the Communists. And I include the article from the Texas Quarterly in the RECORD following my remarks.

Although he finds that the relationship that does exist is in many instances a close partnership, he also believes, and I think correctly, that a final agglomeration, or lack of one, cannot be predicted.

Given the separation between the two

campus which does exist—on ideology, tactics, and goals, for example—Brownfeld details how the shifting is being made by the new left which has modified or moved toward the more stable organization of the Communists.

The relationship exists as one of attacking the common enemy more often than promoting the common solution, especially in the fragmented ranks of the new left, but, even so, there is admitted use by both camps of the resources of the other in pursuit of even these negative goals.

Especially interesting is Brownfeld's discussion of the new left's association with the Communists in light of their ignorance of communism's contradictions and brutality—the same contradictions and brutality they ascribe to western society.

Although where this partnership is going remains uncertain, where it now stands is expertly examined and exposed.

The article follows:

THE RELATIONSHIP OF COMMUNISM AND THE NEW LEFT

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The Communist Party convention for 1968 was noteworthy in the sense that it marked the first time in many years that the party had nominated candidates for the offices of President and Vice President. But it was even more noteworthy for its statements concerning the New Left and the student rebellions which have occurred on American campuses during the past year.

The leader of the party's youth section stated that Communist Party members played leading roles in organizing demonstrations at several colleges. Gus Hall, secretary general of the party, declared that the Communists supported the efforts of students to win more influence and a greater say in their colleges and universities. The Communists did not, however, fail to point out that some of the tactics and approaches entered into by the New Left left something to be desired. The movement's theories on revolution and guerrilla warfare, according to the Communists, were no more than "petty bourgeois radicalism" and lacked any basis in reality. Hall roundly condemned groups which were peddling an "anti-working class, reactionary concept, sugar-coated by left phrases." (Washington Post, July 10, 1968)

Commenting upon these pronouncements, the Washington Post pointed out that "It used to be the fashion to denounce as fellow travelers anyone who supported any movement the Communists claimed they were supporting. But it was the Communists themselves who were really the fellow-travelers—hitchhiking on the bandwagon of social justice."

The New Left has been subjected to criticism as being no more than a vanguard for Communism, and even potentially conciliatory observers have found it difficult to understand the relationship between the ideology of the student rebels and that of Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries. It is clear that there are many differences, but it is also clear that in many instances there is an ever closer partnership. The real relationship of the New Left to Communism is more obscure than the supporters and foes of the movement would make it appear. It is a relationship involving great passion, but the passions are of both love and hate. Whether it will end in fratricide, disillusionment, or union is not yet possible to say.

In a letter published in the *Harvard Crimson* from the Boston Youth Club of the Communist Party, it is stated quite clearly that Communists join in New Left groups.

The letter says that they do so not to further Communism, but to advance the aims of the non-Communist organizations. The letter states:

"Communists work in a large number of organizations other than their own. We work in these organizations to achieve the stated aims of these organizations—we do not seek to make them into 'Junior Communist parties.' We seek to expand the membership, and to democratize the structure, of these organizations. We also work to raise the consciousness of people in these organizations, as to who their allies and who their opponents are, as a clear perspective facilitates social struggle. We will be found in almost any organization for peace, for jobs, or for freedom . . . We join with people in their everyday long-range struggle for a better life." (October 29, 1965)

Delineating its criticism of the structure of the American university, the letter noted that "Today, the trustees and regents of most universities read like a Who's Who of Lily-White American Capitalism. . . . We feel that the course inadequacies of most universities reflect the composition of their controlling groups."

Writing in the Communist theoretical journal, *Political Affairs*, James Davis states in unequivocal terms that Communists are part of the New Left." He asks the following rhetorical question:

"Are young Communists not in reality part of the New Left? Is this not so, despite our more advanced ideological positions, which stems from our adherence to Marxism-Leninism? Do not we work in all of the New Left organizations: are not there, in fact, vast differences in the strategy and tactics which have been developed by non-party people in these organizations? In other words, I think it is wrong to make distinctions in terms of New Left, on the one hand, and the party position on the other. The party, or individuals within it, have been working with and in New Left organizations." (March 1968, p. 49)

Yet, at the conclusion of the article, Mr. Davis makes it clear that the goal of Communists is not simply to assist the New Left to achieve its own goals. "I know," he concluded, "that in this struggle we will help them and therefore ourselves, and go forward together."

The Students for a Democratic Society included in its Port Huron Statement of 1962 a denunciation of "colonialism, communism, and anti-communism." At its 1965 convention, S.D.S. eliminated from its constitution clauses barring "advocates and apologists of totalitarianism" and opposing "authoritarianism both of Communism and of the domestic right" because they felt that such provisions were "negative and exclusionary" and "smacked of red baiting." Thus, S.D.S. decided to welcome Communists as members and participants, seeing no contradiction between the philosophy of the New Left and that of the Marxist-Leninist left.

The reasons for this reversal are complex, and have not really been defined. One cause appears to be the fact that whatever is popular and widely done and advocated must be, for young people, wrong and erroneous. If members of the "Liberal Establishment" oppose Communism, do not want Communists in their ranks, and consider Communism to be the cause of the Cold War, and since the "Establishment" is wrong and is creating a hypocritical and dehumanized society, then it must follow that the Communists are really all right. In other words, the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

The Communists understand the change in the view of the New Left toward Communism in much clearer terms than do other observers. Initially, the New Left stated its opposition to all forms of totalitarianism. But, as its philosophy evolved, all opposition to totalitarianism on the left seemed to wither away.

Commenting on this change, Bob Heisler, wrote the following in *Political Affairs*:

"The New Left has undergone basic changes in the past six years. These changes have by and large all been in a positive direction. On the attitude of the New Left to the Socialist World: It was not so long ago when the dominant attitude among the radical youth of the sixties was a 'third camp' position proclaiming a plague on both your houses to the east and west . . . The increasing successes of the worldwide national liberation movements, the Cuban revolution, and especially the radicalizing and deepening effect that U.S. naked aggression in Vietnam has had on the thinking of today's Left youth have all been factors in turning many Left youth from the 'third camp' stance of yesterday to today's wide-spread New Left recognition of the role of U.S. foreign policy as the main source of the world's tension." (March, 1966, p. 46)

Concluding his analysis of the change which has overcome the New Left, Mr. Heisler notes that "The New Left has moved from an abstract concern for freedom from 'totalitarian' governments which characterized its thinking during the 'third camp' stage to a concern for freedom here in America in the nitty gritty terms of an end to poverty, Jim Crow, and an assertion of the right to dissent . . ." Heisler expresses the view that "The New Left has moved steadily toward a Marxist approach to this problem. This has also affected the attitudes toward coalition . . . Where three years ago exclusion was the rule, today it is literally a dirty word."

The Communists at some times feel the need to deny that their association with the New Left is aimed at advancing Communism, but at other times they make this quite clear. *Political Affairs* for March 1966 states that "We view united fronts as a necessary tactical and strategic tool for the accomplishments of limited political objectives within the ongoing struggle for the long-range goal of fundamental social transformation."

The New Left is subject to as much criticism from its Communist allies as from those who deplore the fact that Communists have been admitted to membership. The fact that such criticism is friendly, and is meant to correct certain "fallacies" in the New Left's world view is certainly true. But it is also true that the New Left, for all its flirtation with the Communists, and for all its willingness to be used by the Communists, has not yet adopted a Marxist concept of man and society.

Michael Myerson, formerly international secretary of the W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs, states that the refusal to go the whole way with Communist ideology is a contradiction in the thinking of the New Left.

Writing in the *New World Review*, he noted that such a contradiction ". . . is in large part a legacy of McCarthyism, during which U.S. radicalism, and its young successors, were severely damaged. Thus, the new radicals of the sixties have no real bridge with their past, and consequently they often lack historical perspective. This phenomenon manifests itself in different ways. Some of the New Left believe that 1960 was the year one; nothing else matters. Others, while rejecting exclusionary policies of anti-Communism, are deeply affected by the constant barrage of myths that come at them in school, in church, on television, in the papers, etc. So there is a subtle New Left 'anti-Communism' or rather 'know-nothingism.' One third of the world (that third which is in deepest sympathy with the young radicals here) is considered irrelevant. The other two thirds are 'relevant' but it is unclear in what way." (November 1966, p. 60)

Myerson criticized the New Left for its political lack of sophistication, and notes that:

Many young people now becoming Left in this country, who fiercely believe in self de-

termination for all peoples and are truly committed to the cause of peace, still do not understand that the socialist countries are the greatest force for peace and the greatest allies of national liberation movements. Nor do they realize that it is due to Soviet, Chinese and Vietnamese prudence today that we are still alive.

Though championing the New Left, working with it, and even claiming to be an integral part of it, the Communists are somewhat concerned with the failure of the New Left to apply the Marxist philosophy to all situations. The Communists fear that the New Left critique of the American society will not go far enough, and will not result in an awareness by young people that only Communism can cure the problem.

The difference between the "alienation" of the New Left and that discussed in Marxism was pointed out by Don Hammerquist in an article in *Political Affairs*:

"In this country there is the New Left whose critique of capitalism (or the system of the Establishment) is based on what it does to individuals and to their relationships with each other. For them, the alienated individual, not the exploited class, is the primary point of reference. You can see this in their terminology, in such key concepts as: multiplicity, Establishment (bureaucracy, manipulation—or, at the other pole—communism), love, participation, commitment. But, usually this is not the alienated individual of Marxist theory, whose alienation stems from the nature of the work-process under capitalism. Instead, it is closer to the alienated individual of the existentialist—'isolated,' 'lonely,' condemned to total responsibility for his actions, defenseless in his 'absurd' struggle with the forces which oppress him." (October 1966, p. 20)

Hammerquist mocked the philosophy of "nonviolence" to which a portion of the New Left adheres, and expressed the view that "The forces brutalizing and degrading man are so massive that to say that they can only be countered by personal and doctrinal nonviolence is to say that they cannot be countered at all."

The Communist answer, which he urged the New Left to accept, and which some segments of the New Left appear to have accepted, is that ". . . it can be countered by overthrowing the social conditions and institutions responsible."

Though the Communists applaud the New Left's critique of what is wrong with America, they feel that the New Left's only answer is "to live the good life, to transform yourself and to transcend your circumstances." The Communist answer, of course, is to transform society, through the use of force if necessary.

The teaching function of Communism has had a significant effect upon the thinking of the New Left. More and more the New Left has come to agree that society must be totally transformed before any of what it considers to be present evils may be corrected. In addition, its view of what Communism is really about has undergone a significant change.

In an article in *The New World Review*, Frank Emspack, chairman of the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which has its headquarters in Madison, Wisconsin, set forth the perspective which the New Left has adopted concerning both foreign policy on the one hand and the role of Communists in the movement on the other.

He stated:

Many people in the peace movement have begun to view foreign policy and foreign policy making in a fundamentally different light. Rather than looking at it as something that is decided by those in authority—by the "experts"—the peace movement has begun to show that foreign policy should be decided by all of us. We have begun to

make a basic reappraisal not only of our foreign policy, but of the manner in which it is formulated. Many of us are no longer criticizing President Johnson or others because they made a wrong decision at some point—we are attacking President Johnson's right to make the decision in the first place. (December 1965, p. 8)

Concerning the subject of Communism, Emspack was quite clear:

. . . the nature of the peace movement is changing. We are not a "loyal opposition" peace movement. We are a peace movement that will continue to attack the nation's politics in time of war if we feel that the policy is morally and politically wrong. The internal nature of the peace movement is changing. Many of us will not accept any reason for excluding anyone from participating in the fight for peace . . .

What this means is that while Communists were often excluded from non-Communist demonstrations and efforts at the beginning of the New Left's movement against the war, they were later welcomed as allies in a similar and just cause.

The Communist Party has been vitally concerned with the growth of the New Left and has made every effort to increase its own influence within the movement. In his keynote address at the eighteenth national convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., leader Gus Hall stated:

"The most advanced sector of the broad developing force of the new political consciousness is the emerging left trend. This is the expression of the process of radicalization that takes place as a result of all current struggles. Thus there is a left trend in the peace movement, in the civil rights movement, in the labor movement, amongst the very active and militant women's movements. It is an especially powerful factor in the youth movement." (June 22-26, 1966)

Hall stated that the Communist Party should be the catalyst and teacher of the New Left. The New Left, he said, must eventually make a decision: "Either you stay on the level of reforming capitalism as an end in itself. Or you move up to a revolutionary level where you continue to fight for reforms but where you now have a longer range goal, where you will now use the objective developments to bring an end to capitalism and its replacement by socialism."

While the New Left has failed to understand the goals which the Communists have with regard to dominating the movement and altering its course to serve Communist purposes, these goals have been set forth vividly and clearly as can be seen from these excerpts.

The New Left, in a variety of circumstances, has faced Communism in a variety of ways. Part of it is avowedly Marxist, supporting the Viet Cong in the war in Vietnam and urging a total transformation of our society along Communist lines. Another part of the New Left welcomes Communist participation in its organizations, while not accepting a Marxist critique of the problems of the American society. These New Left members speak of participatory democracy rather than the dominance of the proletariat. The Communists hope that with increased efforts they can convert these non-Marxist New Left members to their own way of thinking.

In his volume, *A Prophetic Minority*, Jack Newfield, one of the early participants in the movement, states that many New Left members ". . . are sometimes hopelessly romantic, especially romantic about unromantic aberrations like violence and authoritarianism. Some of them don't quite understand what non-democratic socialism has done to the lives of those who live under its yoke. . . ." (New York, New American Library, March 1967, p. 17)

In his introduction to *A Prophetic Minority*, Michael Harrington, long-time leader of the League for Industrial Democracy, states, ". . . the a-Communism of the New Left is

too agnostic a position in a world in which the bureaucratic collectivist society of Communism is both a model for forced industrialization (China) and for the continuation of dictatorship even after capital has been accumulated." (p. 13)

There is no longer within the New Left a sizable group which will affirm that Communism is totalitarian, as did the Students for a Democratic Society in their founding document. While rejecting particular Communist solutions to particular problems, many in the New Left now state that there is no danger either to the United States or the world from the left. All such dangers, they state, emanate from the right.

In October 1967, a meeting took place in Czechoslovakia between forty Americans and two delegations of Vietnamese revolutionaries. Christopher Jencks, a young writer on the staff of *The New Republic*, attended this meeting and upon his return described his own impressions of the New Left participants.

He stated, "To me, the most striking fact about the young radicals was the extent to which they identified with the Viet Cong. This identification was almost entirely confined to people born after the outbreak of World War II." (*New Republic*, October 21, 1967, p. 21)

He expressed the view that the New Left's sympathy for the Viet Cong was not based on any similarity of style or temperament. The Viet Cong who met in Czechoslovakia were "dignified, restrained, disciplined and apparently selfless . . . about as unlike the spontaneous Americans as any group could conceivably be." What, then, is the tie which held the two apparently dissimilar groups together?

Jencks described their affinity for one another this way:

"The common bond between the New Left and the National Liberation Front is not . . . a common dream or a common experience but a common enemy; the U.S. Government, the system, the Establishment. The young radicals' admiration for the NLF stems from the feeling that the NLF is resisting The Enemy successfully, whereas they are not."

The basis for coalition in this sense is not what you are for, but what you are against. It is possible to oppose the system of government and decision making in the United States from many different vantage points, including all possible variations of the totalitarian approach. The new Left has not yet accepted any of these totalitarian approaches, but insist upon believing that a common enemy is in some way a basis for friendship and even partnership.

The New Left understands the inequities our society has placed in the path of its Negro citizens. It understands that our history books may say one thing, and that realities at different times and places may give evidence of a contradictory feeling. Young people are aware of the double standards practiced by their parents and their teachers.

What they do not know is that all of us are fallible human beings, and none of us is perfect. This, perhaps, is learned with time. They are unaware of the Soviet murder of the Kulaks, they are unaware of the Soviet persecution of the Jews, they do not seem to know that the Hungarian Revolution was put down with the use of extraordinarily brutal force, they have not read Khrushchev's admission of the brutality practiced under Stalin. Thus, Communism enters the picture with its verbal pronouncements of a better and less hypocritical world. Young people, wishing to believe the best and not knowing any better, think they have found a new truth. The current period for the New Left seems to be a period of grappling with it.

One student, attempting to explain the distinction between the New Left and Communism stated that:

"The student groups affiliated with the old sects—Communist, Trotskyist, and Socialist—remain small and isolated and are seen by the New Left as elitist, doctrinaire, and manipulative. The enthusiasts of SNCC and SDS do not engage in sterile, neurotic debates over Kronstadt or the pinpoints of Marxist doctrine. They are thoroughly indigenous radicals; tough, democratic, independent, creative, activist, unsentimental." (*Motive*, October 1965, p. 21)

Answering charges of Communist infiltration of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, Jimmy Garrett, writing in the organization's April 1965 newsletter, states: "Man, the Communists, they're empty man, empty. They've got the same stale ideas, the same bureaucracy . . . When he gets mixed up with us, a Commie dies and a person develops. They're not subverting us, we're subverting them."

Many intellectuals on the "Old Left," often critical of the war in Vietnam themselves, have been very critical of the New Left and its excesses. Thomas Kahn of the League for Industrial Democracy called the New Left "panic disguised as moral superiority." Bayard Rustin, the civil rights leader, warned that the New Left is displaying "a groping fascination with violence." Irving Howe noted that "What you have in the New Left is denunciatory revolutionary talk among young people who don't have the slightest revolutionary impulse. It leads to souring and to enormous malaise." These thoughts were expressed at a meeting held in New York's Woodstock Hotel in May 1967. (*New York Times*, May 17, 1967, p. 33)

Many on the pro-Communist left are concerned with the fact that some are attempting to draw clear lines between the New Left and the Marxist and Maoists. Carl Braden, executive director of the Southern Conference Education Fund, made this clear:

Let's avoid the use of the term New Left unless it is in a quotation by someone. The term is nonsensical, in my opinion; it was devised and has been pushed into the vocabulary by social democrats for the purpose of trying to keep young people away from the so-called Old Left, to wit, the Marxist parties and militant independent socialists. (*National Guardian*, May 13, 1967)

The Communists have for many years attempted to use "the peace movement" for their own purposes. In an article published in 1958, Communist Party leader Arnold Johnson urged Communists to "support, encourage and help develop broad community peace movements and organizations centering at present on the issue of stopping the atomic tests." He told party members to be flexible, to be willing to work with pacifists and conscientious objectors. The reason:

In working with others, it often means finding a new formulation in a speech which is more expressive of the common objective. We can afford to learn from others while contributing our ideas. We must demonstrate our ability to function within the bounds of an organizational program . . . peace is the central issue of our politics and our organization. ("Halt the Tests" in *Party Voice*, No. 2, 1958)

The Communists, in recent years, have been implementing the policy which Arnold Johnson set forth in 1958. They have attempted to use the New Left, the peace movement, and other dissenting groups to support Communist aims. Often, they have met with great success.

The New Left has been compared with a group called the Wandervogel which existed in Germany in the period after World War I. Its gospel was "love, not power" and it found many disciples, traveling from town to town. The long haired boys and girls, walking barefooted or with sandals, often practiced free love and displayed many flowers. Wreaths with thousands of flowers were in evidence at their meetings, and wherever they went they attracted many converts.

Discussing this German youth group, Professor Walter Laquer of the Institute of Contemporary History in London points out that:

It all sounded very profound and various gurus had great acclaim, even though their parables were hardly applicable at a time of political and social crisis . . . the group broke up. Some became Fascists, others Communists. There was the underlying readiness to believe that not only Germany had failed, but that society as a whole was in a state of deep and irremediable decay. It was an age of uncertainty, of dissolving beliefs and of an approach to nihilism. But since young people, as a rule, do not persist in nihilism for very long, except as a pose, everyone was very desperately groping for revolutionary new ideas and solutions to the problem. (*Washington Post*, January 7, 1968)

Laquer believes that the youthful rebellion cannot be psychologically explained in pseudo-Marxist terms with reference to economic grievances but, on the contrary, such rebellions occur only in times of prosperity and after a prolonged period of uninterrupted economic growth.

He states:

That a youth movement of protest did not develop in 1930 or in 1946 is no accident. In a real crisis, few people have the time or inclination to ponder the discontents of civilization and cultural pessimism becomes a luxury few can afford. There are more urgent tasks to be faced, such as the question of physical survival. The restlessness of youth, its innate revolutionary spirit, its unwillingness to accept established norms is a natural part of the human condition, but it can manifest itself in the particular way we are now experiencing only in times of relative peace and prosperity and only in a bourgeois milieu. (*Washington Post*, January 7, 1968)

The earlier movement was a protest against what young people considered to be outworn traditions and values. But the earlier movement also created new ideas and new forms of expression. The current movement has been less strong on the creative side. Laquer said that the older movement developed in its members "qualities of sincerity, decency, open-mindedness and idealism." But it also made them "profoundly anti-democratic" and the "easy prey of philosophical charlatans and political demagogues preaching all kinds of eccentric doctrines."

What the New Left has accepted, by and large, is not Communism, or Marxism, but a destructive nihilism. While urging "participatory democracy" they have turned to such philosophers as Professor Herbert Marcuse as their heroes. In a book called "A Critique of Pure Tolerance," Marcuse gives us some idea why the New Left is so strenuous about claiming liberty for itself but unwilling to grant liberty to others. People confused about politics, he says, don't really know how to use freedom of speech correctly—turning such freedom into "an instrument for abolishing servitude," so that "that which is radically evil now appears as good." They employ their freedom for improper purposes.

Having established this premise, Marcuse recommends "the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, racial and religious discrimination or which oppose the extension of public services." He says the correct political attitude is one of "intolerance against movements from the right and toleration of movements from the left." While Marcuse is critical of the bureaucratization of the Soviet Union and China, what he proposes, in essence, is a dictatorship of the left.

The New Left knows that the American society of today is rapidly moving toward one in which the individual may become obsolete. Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia University and conservative commentator James Burnham have both agreed that there is a strong reactionary element in the New

Left rebellion. Observing the coming age of technocracy, the New Left resembles the Luddites who, at the time of the Industrial Revolution, smashed all of the machines, hoping thereby to forestall their effect.

The values enunciated by the New Left often sound quite conservative: individualism, democracy, decentralization. The tactics, however, are far different. They involve violence, and the silencing of all those who disagree. Also involved is a blindness to history, and a willingness to make common cause with Communism, a movement which stands for all of the things which the New Left so vigorously opposes, except that the New Left does not seem aware of this reality.

If the New Left succeeds in tearing down a society about whose replacement it seems unconcerned, it may be certain that others have a blueprint for such a contingency. This is what the Communists are counting on, and the New Left, if it is to remain true to its own highest ideals, must not permit itself to play the role of a Trojan horse. This remains one of the most serious challenges faced by the movement.

CANADA AND NATO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, why should NATO leaders plead with Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada to remain in NATO?

Canada, under Trudeau, has compromised its position with the free world and should be excluded from NATO participation in the interests of national defense and national security.

Our State Department and military leaders must be aware that last month Trudeau's leaders decided Canada should not only recognize Red China, but also seek full diplomatic relations.

Profit from the sale of Canadian wheat to mainland China and Castro's Cuba may be an excuse for departing from the free world bloc; however, diplomatic relations mean exchanges between Canada and Communist China which can but endanger security with NATO and the United States as well.

We Americans can perform one function to help awaken our friends, the Canadians, to their retrogressive leader—the Canadian Castro—by boycotting Canadian products and cutting off American finance and investment. Simply help the Canadian people decide who they need the most—their American neighbors, tourism, and markets or Trudeau, Mao, Castro, and the Communist grain market.

Little wonder the Toronto Globe and Mail questioned the Canadian abstention on the U.N. October 30, 1968, vote calling for arms and moral support for guerrillas—Chinese Communist armed and trained—to attack their former Commonwealth allies, Rhodesia and South Africa.

The answer is now evident. Trudeau, by voting might have alienated his Communist grain allies with a loss of their market.

Mr. Speaker, I insert clippings from

the Washington, D.C., Evening Star and from the Toronto Globe and Mail as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 19, 1968]

CANADA REPORTED PLANNING FULL RECOGNITION OF PEKING

(By Michael Cope)

TORONTO.—Canada has suddenly decided to seek full diplomatic relations with Communist China. The move also may mean breaking off relations with Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government in Taiwan.

The Canadian decision, reportedly taken at a cabinet meeting in Ottawa yesterday, and still not officially announced, is the first major policy shift by Prime Minister Pierre-Elliott Trudeau.

It is part of a wide-ranging over-all foreign policy review ordered by Trudeau following his Liberal party's win in last June's general election. Other policy changes still under consideration include possible Canadian withdrawal from both NATO and NORAD (North American Air Defense Command).

The China question was reportedly decided before the other issues so Canada's new position could be announced before President-elect Richard M. Nixon is sworn in on Jan. 20.

KEY TOPIC

It will undoubtedly be a major topic when Secretary of State designate William P. Rogers meets with Canadian External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp, probably late next month.

Ottawa sources indicated a statement will be made by the government after the New Year's holiday.

Ever since he took over as prime minister from Lester Pearson last April, Trudeau has been in favor of recognizing the Peking regime.

As long ago as last May 29 he said: "We have an economic interest in trade with China and a political interest in preventing tensions between China and its neighbors, but especially between China and the United States."

MAJOR SPY BASE

"Canada has long advocated a positive approach to mainland China and its inclusion in world affairs."

Ever since this statement the American Embassy in Ottawa reportedly has been lobbying strongly to dissuade Canada. A Chinese Communist diplomatic post in Canada, the Americans have argued, would become a major spy base and seriously threaten North American security.

Ottawa sources said Trudeau was anxious to adopt a two-China policy—equal recognition of both Communist Peking and Nationalist Taiwan—but preliminary talks with the Communists suggested Peking insists Canada recognize their sovereignty over all of China, including Taiwan.

The prime minister's earlier reference to Canada trade relations with Communist China refers to wheat sales in the past few years.

WHEAT ACCORD

Under the present three-year wheat agreement with Peking, which expires next July, the Chinese agreed to buy a maximum of 270-million bushels of Canadian wheat for \$470-million. By last month, Peking had ordered 255 million bushels.

There have been suggestions in Hong Kong, where Canada conducts most of its trading relations with the Communists, that future wheat agreements may depend on diplomatic recognition.

The Ottawa report that Canada has at last decided to grant that recognition is substantiated by a memorandum issued by the External Affairs Department to all Canadian foreign missions that in future the term "Red

China" or "Mainland China" must not be used. Instead the Communist nation should be referred to by its formal title, "The People's Republic of China."

Similarly, another memorandum instructed that all official correspondence refer to the Taiwan Nationalist regime simply as the "Government of Formosa."

CRITICISM FORESEEN

Undoubtedly the Canadian decision will be unpopular in Washington and reflects Trudeau's decision to chart an independent foreign policy course which will certainly be in conflict with U.S. policies.

One Ottawa source suggested, though, it was Trudeau's belief that the new Nixon administration will be most flexible at the beginning of its term of office.

Canada's first ambassador to Communist China is expected to be Chester Ronning, 73, the country's foremost expert on Asian affairs who was born at Fancheng in Hupeh province, where his parents were Norwegian Lutheran missionaries. He speaks fluent Mandarin.

"It is impossible to deal successfully with Asia's problems until we recognize what has taken place in China and set up diplomatic machinery to cope with the many problems which must be dealt with to ensure peaceful settlements," he has declared.

CANADA'S POSITION ON RHODESIA ATTACKED IN TORONTO

"Canada should have voted no," says Toronto Globe and Mail.

On October 30th the U.N. Trusteeship Committee passed a resolution calling for the use of force against Rhodesia despite the objections of the main Western nations including Britain and the U.S., who voted against the resolution. The Canadian representative, however, abstained and subsequently, when the resolution went to the General Assembly, abstained again. An editorial in the Toronto (Ontario) Globe and Mail early in November severely criticised the Canadian position.

"Why," it states, "did Canada's representative in the United Nations fail to oppose an Afro-Asian resolution before the General Assembly's Trusteeship Committee which called, among other things, for the use of force by Britain to oust Ian Smith's regime in Rhodesia and for arms and moral support for guerrillas?"

"True, our representative on the committee, Marvin Gelber, did not vote for the resolution. Canada simply abstained. But what utter nonsense. One either supports or opposes violence—there is no place here for abstention. . . .

"Mr. Gelber, in an interview, offered this justification: 'If Canada is to do anything in the way of maintaining the usefulness of the Commonwealth in this (Rhodesian) situation, it has to earn the confidence of the African States, who are very skeptical. We are avoiding widening the gap between the white states and others'. . . .

"Among the nine paragraphs on which we would have abstained on a paragraph-by-paragraph vote, the most startling called on all states to render moral and material assistance to Zimbabwe freedom fighters in the guerrilla warfare against the Smith regime. Why abstain on this? Are we not opposed to anything that could turn the Rhodesian situation from a battle of words to a war of weapons?"

"Politicians, and nations, cannot please all the people all the time. Nor should they. We are not at the United Nations to make friends by bending our standards; we are there to influence people by standing up for our principles. As long as paragraphs inciting violence were attached to Wednesday's document, it was a bad package. Canada should have voted no."

JAMES J. P. McSHANE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the untimely death of James J. P. McShane, formerly Chief Marshal of the United States, who died on December 23, 1968.

As a policeman and detective for the New York City Police Department, and as Chief U.S. Marshal, Mr. McShane was dedicated to upholding the law and securing justice. His work over the many decades with which he was associated with law enforcement was always of the highest quality, and his courage in the face of danger never wavered.

Although his record with the New York City Police Department was an outstanding one, he will probably be best remembered for his work as Chief Marshal during the period of civil rights confrontation in the South. He was present at nearly every civil rights confrontation of this decade. Jim McShane personally escorted James Meredith onto the campus of the University of Mississippi during the historic confrontation with Mississippi State officials in 1962. In later years he was present at the University of Alabama when two Negroes sought to enroll at that school and at Selma during the 1965 freedom march from Selma to Montgomery.

Whether he was apprehending suspects in New York City or enforcing the law in the South, he always upheld the law with the same spirit of impartiality. He believed that competent and equitable law enforcement was essential to social justice. His own record as policeman, detective, investigator, and Chief U.S. Marshal provides an outstanding example of the values he espoused.

I first knew Jim McShane when I served as Assistant District Attorney of New York County and he was a detective in the New York City Police Department. I shall certainly miss his friendship and want to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. McShane, their son Michael, their daughter Mary Anne, and the other members of his family.

At this point in the RECORD I include the obituary which appeared in the New York Times on December 24, 1968:

JAMES McSHANE, CHIEF MARSHAL WHO ESCORTED MEREDITH, IS DEAD

WASHINGTON, December 23.—James J. P. McShane, Chief United States Marshal, died today of pneumonia in the Marsalle rest home. He was 59 years old and lived in Alexandria.

It was Mr. McShane, who, after a 15-hour riot that capped a week of violence, stood shoulder-to-shoulder with James H. Meredith as the Negro student finally walked onto the campus of the University of Mississippi. That confrontation with Mississippi authorities at Oxford took place in September, 1962.

Mr. McShane's death brought a tribute from Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who said: "Jim McShane was totally dedicated to justice. As a policeman, an investigator, United States marshal and finally as Chief Marshal of the United States, he stood for excellence in law enforcement."

AT RIGHTS CONFRONTATIONS

The burly former New York policeman, who had shot it out with lawbreakers seven times in his first two years on the force, was present at nearly every major civil-rights confrontation of this decade.

He supervised Federal marshals sent to Montgomery, Ala., during the Freedom Ride disturbances in 1961; he was at Tuscaloosa, Ala., in June, 1963, when two Negroes sought to enter the University of Alabama, and at Selma, Ala., in March, 1965, during the Freedom March there, and he was in charge of peace keeping while the Poor People's Campaign was conducted in Washington last spring.

"I wouldn't want to be the one to start shoving Jim around," said a former colleague, when Mr. McShane retired from the force in 1957, and went to Washington to become an investigator for a Senate inquiry into improper activities in the labor and management fields.

SCUFFLE AT UNIVERSITY

Five years later, he scuffled with Paul B. Johnson, then Mississippi's Lieutenant Governor, at the entrance to the University of Mississippi.

"Governor, I think it's my duty to try to go through and get Mr. Meredith in there," Mr. McShane told Mr. Johnson, in an encounter that was seen by a nationwide television audience.

The state troopers crowded behind Mr. Johnson, who replied:

"We are going to block you, and if there is any violence it will be on your part."

"I'm only doing my duty as a United States marshal," Mr. McShane replied. "I would like to go in."

The Chief Marshal then sought to shoulder his way past the Lieutenant Governor, who with the troopers, pushed him back.

REPLY BY JOHNSON

Mr. McShane then sought to go around the Lieutenant Governor's right side, but Mr. Johnson and the troopers pushed him back again.

"We have told you you can't go in and we intend to use whatever force is necessary," said Mr. Johnson.

The Meredith party, accompanied by a state patrol escort and Federal officials, returned to their cars and drove away.

Mr. Meredith was escorted onto the campus five days later, after a Federal court found Gov. Ross R. Barnett and Mr. Johnson guilty of civil contempt.

Other celebrated cases, included his escorting in July, 1962, of Dr. Robert A. Soblen, the convicted Communist spy. Soblen, who was expelled from Israel, where he had sought sanctuary from his life sentence in the United States, stabbed himself on an El Al jet en route from Israel to the United States. But Mr. McShane was not blamed for the suicide attempt because he was to have no direct control over Soblen until the plane reached the United States.

Soblen recovered from the stab wounds, but died subsequently after taking an overdose of barbiturates.

The powerfully built 6-footer, with thick graying hair became a bodyguard for Senator John F. Kennedy shortly before the Democratic National Convention of 1960, and traveled with him throughout his successful campaign. President Kennedy appointed him Chief Marshal in May, 1962.

The nation's top law enforcement officer found himself temporarily on the wrong side of the law, when he was indicted by a state court in November, 1962, for "inciting" the riots at the University of Mississippi during which two persons were killed.

James Joseph Patrick McShane was born on St. Patrick's Day 1909, in the shadow of the Polo Grounds.

As a schoolboy, he was a Golden Gloves champion, fighting as a lightweight at 135 pounds.

He joined the police force in 1936 and won 12 citations for bravery during his 21 years on the force.

WINNING A REPUTATION

Mr. McShane quickly made his reputation. During his first two years, he killed one man and wounded two others in gun battles.

When asked how he had escaped the bullets fired at him, he said: "I went to bobbing-and-weaving school."

His interest in boxing once led to a temporary demotion. In 1954, Mr. McShane while off duty, attended the weighing-in at Madison Square Garden of Rocky Marciano, the world Heavyweight champion, for the fight in which he successfully defended his title against Ezzard Charles.

Mr. McShane and the champion were old friends. As they left the Garden in the rain, Detective McShane obliged the cameramen when one of them handed him an umbrella and asked him to hold it over Marciano's head.

DEMOTED BY ADAMS

Police Commissioner Francis W. H. Adams demoted Detective McShane from second to third grade and exiled him to the Bronx. The Commissioner said the photograph gave the impression that New York was using its police force to grace such ceremonies. He also invoked the rule against detectives being photographed lest criminals might get to know them on sight.

Commissioner Adams restored Detective McShane's grade 10 days later after publicly admitting that he had been wrong.

Mr. McShane's outstanding act of police heroism occurred on Nov. 9, 1939, when he routed three robbers as they fled from a West Side grocery store. He knocked out the lookout man with his nightstick, shot and killed one bandit and wounded the third with a shot through his gun hand.

This brought him promotion from patrolman to detective and a free lunch at City Hall as the guest of Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia.

Mr. McShane is survived by his widow, the former Teresa Curtis, a son Michael, a lieutenant in the Air Force; a daughter Mary Anne Day of Alexandria, Va.; two brothers, Edward Martin of New York and Arthur Martin, both of New York; a sister, Mrs. Frank Dore of New York, and two grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held Friday at 10:30 A.M. in St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church in Alexandria.

TRIBUTE TO THE APOLLO 8 CREWMEN

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday next the Congress of the United States at a joint session will have the opportunity to extend its highest esteem in admiration to the heroic crew of Apollo 8, Col. Frank Borman, Capt. James A. Lovell, and Lt. Col. William A. Anders.

It is almost impossible to find sufficiently superlative terms to describe adequately the tremendous achievement of those three great and outstanding Americans. Perhaps it would be best if our thoughts turned toward humility and gratitude that their mission to the

moon was such an unqualified success and that they have returned safe and well to the earth.

The men of NASA have indeed much to be proud of during the year 1968 which was capped by the Apollo 8 flight. They should, indeed, take great pride in our men and women in and out of Government who work on our space program for their dedication and for their consistent professional competence. As Spacecraft Commander Borman said on the deck of the carrier *Yorktown*, the success of the astronauts was also the success of thousands and thousands of people who gave unstintingly of themselves and their talents of many years and months to the Apollo program.

The same could be said of the success NASA has achieved in the exploration of space in many other programs during 1968. I think it is most appropriate at this particular time to include a narrative chronology of NASA's achievements in space sciences and technology that have led to new knowledge and new capabilities in our quest to explore space for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all mankind.

The above-mentioned information follows:

In 1968, its Tenth Anniversary year, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration marked a decade of progress in all aspects of space exploration and rallied its resources for the lunar landing scheduled for 1969.

The year 1968 saw the first two manned launches—Apollo 7 and 8—in the Apollo program plus successful missions by unmanned satellites which brought new knowledge of the solar system which American astronauts hope to explore after the lunar landing.

UNMANNED PROGRESS

Surveyor 7, NASA's first 1968 mission, wrote a rewarding scientific finish to the Surveyor lunar photography program which successfully soft-landed five spacecraft on the Moon.

Scientists, astronomers and engineers estimate that, in the brief months since the summer of 1964 when NASA's Ranger spacecraft flew its first successful mission, man has learned more about the Moon than in all the 350 years since Galileo first viewed it through his telescope.

Other significant 1968 unmanned satellites include the Radio Astronomy Explorer (RAE), launched July 4, and the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory (OAO-II), launched Dec. 7.

RAE, with its antenna booms extending more than 1,500 feet from tip to tip, has the largest span of any spacecraft orbited to date. It has monitored low-frequency radio signals from space sources, including the Sun's galaxy, the Milky Way, from the Sun and from Earth itself.

Its data will provide astronomers with their first detailed radio map of the Milky Way and, by mapping thousands of unidentified radio sources throughout the sky, scientists hope to learn about some which, by process of elimination, may prove to come from beyond our galaxy.

The OAO-II is the heaviest (4,400 pounds) and most complex unmanned spacecraft launched by the U.S. to date. Its successful orbit and operation provides astronomers with a new vantage point for "seeing" in the ultraviolet, infrared, X-ray and gamma radiations for looking at most of the ingredients necessary for knowing the solar system's makeup today and what course it may be taking.

The Smithsonian Institution experiment aboard the OAO-II with its seven photometric systems has been designed to perform

basically identification and mapping functions, whereas the University of Wisconsin experiment with four telescopes is capable of more intensive study of individual stars, planets and outer space phenomena.

During the first quarter of 1968, OGO-V joined its sister geophysical observatories after its launch March 4, into a long elliptical orbit around the Earth. It is concentrating on a study of energetic particles, electric and magnetic fields and other phenomena in Earth's vicinity, while OGO-IV, in a low altitude polar orbit, studies principally the Earth's atmosphere and ionosphere, including auroral phenomena in the polar cap regions.

OSO-IV, along with its cousin, OSO-III, continued to observe the Sun and its radiations from Earth orbit during the year. OSO-IV was launched in the last quarter of 1967.

GEOS-II, launched January 11, joined GEOS-I in continuing measurements of the Earth's gravity field and in establishing more precisely the shape and size of the planet.

GEOS-II carries a laser detector device which has permitted it to receive and analyze laser signals beamed at the satellite from Earth stations in a series of continuing experiments. In May for the first time, the spacecraft identified a laser beam directly to it while it was illuminated in sunlight.

Operating from a stationary orbit over the Equator at an altitude of 22,240 miles, NASA's ATS-III continued its significant contributions to meteorology and communications. Its communications channels served to augment commercial circuitry in helping to bring the events of Olympic Games in Mexico City, the Apollo 7 and 8 space flights, and other world news to television viewers in Europe and North America.

Pioneer-IX, launched Nov. 8, added a new spacecraft to NASA's team of Sun-orbiting satellites assigned to study space continuously from widely separated positions. The spacecraft joined Pioneers VI, VII and VIII in studying the nature and interrelationship of interplanetary magnetic fields, the solar wind and solar cosmic rays.

These four Pioneers are contributing significantly to accuracy in forecasting solar flares. Their observations form part of the forecasting procedures used to decide whether radiation conditions in space at a given time will permit safe journeys for American Apollo astronauts.

Riding piggy-back into orbit with Pioneer IX was the 40-pound TETR-2 satellite. In its 200-by-500-mile Earth orbit, it is currently being used as an orbiting target for checking out equipment and training personnel of NASA's Manned Space Flight Network in preparation for future Apollo missions.

Although no Mariner planetary flights were initiated during the year, scientists calculated that on Jan. 4, Mariner V's orbit carried it within about 54 million miles of the Sun. This was closer than any other man-made object has approached to the center of our solar system. The spacecraft made its closest approach to Venus in October 1967.

Preparations continued during 1968 for Mariner flights to Mars in 1969, in 1971 and in 1973. NASA announced that the 1973 mission would be named Project Viking and would use the Titan III-D/Centaur as its launch vehicle.

Viking Mars 1973 science equipment will be finally determined after the 1969 mission to the planet. Two 6,000-pound orbiting spacecraft will each send soft lander vehicles to the Martian surface. Mission objectives place special emphasis on returning information about life on the planet.

The orbiting of Air Density and Injun satellites (Explorers XXXIX and XL) August 8 with a single Scout launch vehicle extended studies of complex radiation-air

density relations to areas in space above the Earth's polar regions.

Besides launches serving its own experiment programs, NASA successfully launched seven other spacecraft for other agencies or governments during the year. They included the NRL Solar Explorer for the U.S. Navy, two weather satellites, ESSA VII and VIII, for the Environmental Science Services Administration and Atlantic I of the Intelsat III series for Comsat Corp.

INTERNATIONAL

For the European Space Research Organization, ESRO-I and II and HEOS-I were launched in NASA's International Cooperation Program.

Also during this year, 35 investigators from eight foreign countries were selected to carry out experiments with the first lunar surface samples to be retrieved by NASA. Four contributed foreign experiments were flown on NASA spacecraft, 122 sounding rockets were launched in scientific programs with eight countries, geodetic satellite observations were carried out with 34 countries, and significant aeronautical research was conducted with Canada, France, Germany and the United Kingdom.

MANNED FLIGHT

In manned flight, the decision to boost Apollo 8 to orbital flight around the Moon December 21 directly reflected the Apollo program's overall maturity and operational readiness, progressively demonstrated by three flights and supporting ground test programs during 1968.

The precise reentry and splashdown October 22, of the 11-day Apollo 7 flight ended what was called a 101-percent successful mission. Manned by Astronauts Walter Schirra, Donn Eisele, and Walter Cunningham, the Apollo 7 performed flawlessly for more than 260 hours in space, including firings of the spacecraft's primary propulsion system and the first live TV from a U.S. manned vehicle.

Shortly after launch, with the Saturn IB rocket second stage still attached to the spacecraft, the astronauts exercised manual control of the combined vehicle from the spacecraft. Following space vehicle separation, the astronauts flew the spacecraft around the second stage and simulated a docking, using the lunar module adapter as the target. Later, with the second stage in a different orbit, the spacecraft "found" the vehicle and rendezvoused with it—demonstrating the ability of the command module to maneuver to the lunar module if the latter should become disabled on a manned lunar landing mission.

Most of the critical tests necessary to "wing out" the spacecraft equipment took place early in the flight. Crew performance, prime and back-up systems, and mission support facilities were checked.

The astronauts used hand-held movie and still cameras to photograph both Earth and stars. The astronauts had colds during the flight.

The flight not only accomplished all mission objectives, but also completed some tests not included in the original flight plan. Apollo 7 flew some 4.5 million miles on the first manned Apollo flight.

The April 4 flight of Apollo 6 was the second unmanned Saturn V mission to demonstrate launch vehicle and spacecraft systems performance. Two problems were experienced with the rocket systems—vertical oscillations or "POGO" effect in the first stage and rupture of small propellant lines in the upper stages.

Through a determined post-mission analysis and an aggressive ground testing and evaluation program, these Saturn V problems were corrected.

During the Jan. 22-23, Apollo 5 mission, lunar module systems and structural performance met all objectives, including two

firings of both the ascent and descent propulsion systems.

The unmanned lunar module was boosted into Earth orbit by a Saturn IB. Post-flight analysis determined the lunar module ready for manned Earth orbital missions.

During 1968, Scientist-Astronauts John A. Llewellyn and Brian T. O'Leary withdrew from the training program, Air Force Lt. Col. Michael Collins underwent surgery for removal of an arthritic bone growth, and Navy Lt. John S. Bull withdrew due to pulmonary disease. Astronaut James A. Lovell, Jr. replaced Collins in the Apollo 8 crew as command module pilot. The original Apollo 8 crew was redesignated for the Apollo 9 mission when the lunar module was deleted from Apollo 8.

AERONAUTICS

Among the continuing research and development projects in aeronautics are noise abatement, flight safety, the materials, propulsion and flight dynamics of supersonic and hypersonic aircraft, lifting bodies and Vertical Short Takeoff and Landing (VSTOL) craft.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

NASA scientists and engineers, working with university and industry groups, pushed ahead in the fields of space power, electric, nuclear and chemical propulsion to enhance

the capability of already-proven launch vehicles.

TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION

NASA continued to transfer to industry, small business and the scientific community the new technology coming out of space-related research and development activity. Most of this technology comes from NASA field centers where specialists continuously review research and development projects for promising new ideas. In addition, NASA contractors are required to report inventions, discoveries, innovations and improved techniques they develop in work for NASA.

TRACKING NETS

Three basic tracking networks keep tabs on NASA's orbiting satellites: Manned Space Flight Network (MSFN), Deep Space Network (DSN) and the Space Tracking and Data Acquisition Network (STADAN).

There are 26 sites in the three networks, some single, some of multiple purpose, located in 15 countries around the world. Each network is designed to support specific types of missions, depending on whether it is near Earth, manned or probing deep space.

These networks are constantly being strengthened to handle the demands of the newer and increasingly sophisticated satel-

lites. In 1969, NASA plans to add a 210-foot-diameter antenna in Spain and in Australia to beef up the DSN for future missions into deep space.

The 210's provide six-and-a-half times increased performance over existing 85-foot antennas, making it possible to return useful scientific data from three and one-half billion miles from Earth.

NASA MAJOR LAUNCH RECORD, OCTOBER 1959 TO DECEMBER 1968

Year	Number of launches	Vehicle results		Mission results	
		Success	Failure	Success	Failure
1958	4	0	4	0	4
1959	14	8	6	8	6
1960	17	10	7	9	8
1961	23	16	7	15	8
1962	27	23	4	20	7
1963	13	12	1	11	2
1964	30	26	4	25	5
1965	31	27	4	26	5
1966	36	33	3	26	10
1967	27	25	2	25	2
1968	21	16	5	17	4
10-year total	243	196	45	182	60

¹ Figures do not include "unrated" items.

² Includes 2 satellites launched on 1 vehicle.

MAJOR NASA LAUNCHES, 1968

Date	Name	Launch vehicle	Launch site	Mission	Results	
					Vehicle	Mission
January 7	Surveyor VII	Atlas-Centaur	KSC	Lunar photos; lunar surface analyses.	Success	Success.
January 11	Explorer XXXVI	Delta	WTR	Geodesy	do	Do.
January 22	Apollo 5	Saturn IB	KSC	Lunar module test	do	Do.
March 4	OGO-V	Atlas-Agena	KSC	Earth-Sun data	do	Do.
March 5	Explorer XXXVII	Scout	WI	Solar radiation	do	Do.
April 4	Apollo 6	Saturn V	KSC	Launch vehicle test	Unrated	Unrated.
May 16	ESRO-II-B	Scout	WTR	Radiation investigation	Success	Success. ¹
May 18	Explorer XXXVIII	TAT-Agena	WTR	Meteorology	Failure	Failure.
July 4	Explorer XXXIX	Delta	WTR	Radioastronomy	Success	Success.
July 8	Explorer XL	Scout	WTR	Atmospheric density data	do	Do.
Aug. 10	ATS-IV	Atlas-Centaur	KSC	Charged particle data	do	Do.
Aug. 16	ESSA 7	Delta	WTR	Spacecraft technology	Failure	Failure.
Sept. 18	Intelsat III	Delta	KSC	Cloud cover photos	Success	Success. ¹
Oct. 3	ESRO I	Scout	WTR	Communications	Failure	Failure. ¹
Oct. 11	Apollo 7	Saturn IB	KSC	Auroras	Success	Success. ¹
Nov. 8	Pioneer IX	Delta	KSC	First manned Apollo	do	Do.
Dec. 5	TETR-2	Delta	KSC	Solar radiation	do	Do.
Dec. 7	HEOS 1	Delta	KSC	Tracking training	do	Do.
Dec. 15	ESSA 8	Delta	WTR	Interplanetary physics	do	Do.
Dec. 18	Intelsat III	Delta	KSC	Astronomy	do	Do.
Dec. 21	Apollo 8	Saturn V	KSC	Meteorology	do	Do.
				Communications	do	Unrated. ¹
				Scheduled for launch Dec. 21		

¹ Non-NASA mission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 8, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into Him who is the head.—Ephesians 4: 15.

Our Father in heaven and on earth, whose spirit dwells in the hearts of all men, make us conscious of Thy presence as we bow in prayer before Thee.

We have been taught to walk the way of truth and to live the life of love. May truth so triumph in our minds that we may overcome low prejudices with high principles and may love so live in our hearts that we may relate ourselves affirmatively to our fellow men. With truth and love alive within us may we devote ourselves to the welfare of our beloved country.

In the name of Him whose truth and love keeps men free we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will any Member-elect who has not been sworn come to the well of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. LUKENS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

TRADE AND OTHER TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING SOUTHERN RHODESIA—A COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-37)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which

was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By virtue of my authority under Section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, I issued on July 29 Executive Order No. 11419 relating to trade and other transactions involving Southern Rhodesia. It extends the mandatory selective sanctions imposed in Executive Order No. 11322 of January 5, 1967, which I transmitted to you on February 27, 1967. A copy of Executive Order 11419 is attached.

The current Order prohibits virtually all financial and trade transactions between the United States and Southern